THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. V OCTOBER, 1922 No. 28

EDITORIAL

The recognition of the validity of Anglican Ordinations by the Holy Synod of the Church of Constantinople is an event of far-reaching significance in the history of Christendom. For four hundred years disruptive tendencies have held high sway in the Christian Church. Two years ago the Lambeth Conference marked a turning-point by an Appeal which stirred men's consciences in every part of the world. To-day a first practical step is taken—not in direct response to that appeal, but surely in marked accord with its spirit—towards healing the breaches which divide us. No doubt, it is only the beginning of the road; but it is the right road. And it is a step which comes home with a special significance at the present time; for never since the Edict of Milan has any part of the Church suffered such a martyrdom as that which is the fate of our brethren of the Eastern Churches to-day. And they stand firm. Could we drink the cup that they drink of, and be baptized with the baptism which they are baptized with? Their offer of fellowship at this moment is a sign of their confidence in us, and a claim upon our prayers. *Morituri nos salutant.*

A word of gratitude is in place here to the patient work of the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches Association. Those who have read Mr. Athelstan Riley's collection of the late Mr. W. J. Birkbeck's papers, or Mr. A. J. Douglas's recent work on Intercommunion with the East, will know something of what this work has been. And we believe that the pioneers in it would wish to insist that there is no one who has done more by his understanding, sympathy, and encouragement for the cause of Reunion with the East than the present Archbishop of Canterbury.

K.O.P.E.C. It is a great thing to have a title of which the initials can be cooked into a word. This is the case with the *Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, and Citizenship*, a packet of whose papers has just reached us. Its purpose is "to

unite Christians in a common quest for a fuller understanding of the mind of God " and its better expression in our corporate life. The President of the Council is the Bishop of Manchester, and the Hon. Secretaries the Rev. C. E. Raven and Miss Lucy Gardner. The papers now before us consist of a series of questionnaires, compiled for the use of Study Groups. Stress is laid on the primary character of that which deals with " The Nature of God and His Purpose for the World." Others deal with Education, the Home, the Social Function of the Church, Property and Industry, the Social Gospel, the Relations of the Sexes, and other subjects. Each is accompanied by a bibliography. It is intended to devote this and the following winter to the study of these questionnaires and of the replies to them; and the Conference itself is to be held at Birmingham in the spring of 1924. The Central Office is at 92, St. George's Square, London, S.W .1.

Though over 2000 copies of our September number were printed, the whole issue was sold out within a fortnight, and we hope that it may be possible to reprint. We have been particularly interested in enquiries which have reached us from distant parts of the Mission Field, where ambiguity, so often cherished at home, is not a virtue. The strength of the Anglo-Catholic movement is often said to lie in its party organization. That is a fallacy. Its strength lies in the fact that all sections of the movement have a definite and supernatural Gospel to preach, and are mightily in earnest in preaching it. We believe that " parties " have their place in the Church ; but it is not any party note which is struck at the Anglo-Catholic Congresses. It is a larger and louder note than that—the note of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church claiming the whole world for Christ.

The review which we publish below on some recent gnostic books reminds us of the existence of a stream of popular religion which, like King Charles II., has been " an unconscionable time a-dying." We do not suppose that it will die, so long as human curiosity and credulity exist; and every now and then a serious movement like Christian Science springs out of it. Our readers may remember a masterly treatment of the whole subject in Miss McNeile's book on *Theosophy*, published by Messrs. Longman, about three years ago. It was she of whom one of the survivors of the *Egypt* said at the public enquiry: " When I last saw her, she was still at her prayers." Not only the Wantage community, but the whole Church, lost in her a mind of rare value.

LE PROBLÈME CHRISTOLOGIQUE D'APRÈS LE REV. DR. H. M. RELTON

C'EST avec un grand plaisir que l'auteur de cet article, se rendant à l'aimable invitation de l'éditeur de THEOLOGY, entreprend l'exposé de l'Etude christologique du Rev. Dr. H. M. Relton.* Ce livre très distingué est à coup sûr déjà connu des lecteurs de cette revue, et sans doute cet article leur apprendra peu de chose; on a pensé cependant qu' ils ne verraient pas sans intérêt la même question abordée par un théologien appartenant à l'Eglise catholique Romaine; les problèmes qui sont étudiés dans ce livre préoccupent tous les chrétiens, et l'enquête de M. Relton est conduite avec tant de conscience et tant de talent, qu'on est heureux de la prendre pour point de départ d'une discussion nouvelle.

Le premier mot de cette discussion sera un hommage rendu aux autorités qui s'imposent à notre foi: tout théologien est avant tout un chrétien; s'il cherche, c'est qu'il croit. C'est la foi qui lui propose le terme lointain qu'il s'efforce de mieux entendre et les documents qui orientent ses recherches. Il redit volontiers avec saint Hilaire: " Non est humano aut sæculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum . . . quæ scripta sunt legamus, et quæ legerimus intellegamus; et tum perfectæ fidei officio fungemur."† Quiconque a quelque idée de la grandeur unique du Christ, sent que c'est la profaner que de prétendre la ramener à la commune mesure; si, au terme de son étude, le théologien a réussi à dissiper tout mystère, il peut être sûr d'avoir faussé entièrement les données du problème. Quiconque comprend ce que c'est que la révélation divine, n'a pas la présomption de pénétrer par une autre voie dans les secrets de Dieu; il peut, s'il le veut, ne voir dans les évangiles que des légendes et dans les épîtres de saint Paul que des spéculations hellénistiques ou judaïques; mais alors qu'il renonce à rien comprendre du Christ, ayant effacé de ses propres mains les documents qui le révèlent.

Cette témérité est tout à fait étrangère à M. Relton, et il faut l'en féliciter: à plusieurs reprises, il remarque que la doctrine des deux natures, si suspecte aujourd'hui à tant de théologiens, est profondément empreinte dans l'Evangile et dans tout le Nouveau Testament; c'est ainsi qu'il cite, dans ce sens, ce passage du Dr. Warfield: " Not only is the doctrine of the ' Two Natures ' the synthesis of the entire body of Christological data

* *A Study in Christology*, by Herbert M. Relton, D.D. London: S.P.C.K., 1917; xxxv+278 pp. 8vo. Price 7s. 6d. net (2nd impression, 1922).

† *De Trinit.*, viii. 14, P.L. x. 247.

embodied in the pages of the New Testament; and not only is it the teaching of all the writers of the New Testament severally; but the New Testament provides no material whatever for inferring that a different view was ever held by the Christian community."*

Il insiste aussi, dès la première page de son livre, sur la valeur du dépôt que nous tenons des anciens Pères:

"We venture to think that the value of the ancient Christology, as this reaches us in the creeds and dogmatic utterances of the Councils, cannot be too highly estimated. In it we find preserved the finest results attained by the most acute intellects of the past, and we benefit from the warnings which they give and which they learned as the fruit of much painful controversy and conflict with heretical opinion. Such a deposit is not lightly to be estimated nor hastily to be set aside as outworn dogma" (p. xxix).

A ces paroles très sages on peut et on doit ajouter encore un mot: ce qui pour nous fait le prix de cette tradition, ce n'est pas seulement la sagesse de ceux qui ont accumulé ces trésors, leur longue expérience, leur finesse d'intuition; c'est avant tout le témoignage de l'Esprit qui vit dans l'Eglise et qui nous enseigne par elle avec une autorité irréfragable.

Respectueux des documents de la révélation chrétienne, le théologien le sera aussi et plus encore du mystère qu'il s'efforce de contempler. A plusieurs reprises, le Dr. Relton nous avertit, avec beaucoup de force, que le mystère du Christ dépasse notre expérience:

"We must be quite clear in our minds that His 'consciousness' was different from ours. We have no knowledge of a perfectly pure and sinless consciousness. Moreover, His 'personality' was different from ours. We have no knowledge of an Ego which, because it was eternal, may conceivably have given Him in His incarnate state a knowledge of Himself as He existed prior to His advent in the flesh" (p. 193).

Ce respect, ce sens du mystère, ne brise pas l'effort du théologien; tout au contraire, il lui donne la seule impulsion efficace. Pour le bien entendre, on peut considérer quelle est, en dehors même du christianisme, la force d'attraction que l'idée de Dieu peut exercer sur des âmes. Que l'on compare entre eux les différents systèmes philosophiques qui, aux premiers siècles de notre ère, se partageaient l'opinion païenne: celui qui exerça l'action religieuse la plus profonde fut celui qui sut inspirer à ses adeptes le plus grand respect du mystère divin: quand on parcourt, aujourd'hui encore, les Ennéades de Plotin, on les sent tout entières entraînées vers ce terme lointain que le philosophe

* P. 111; *cf.* p. 38.

entrevoit; et ce qui rend cette impulsion si puissante, ce désir si pressant, c'est la hauteur du but qu'il s'est assigné: plus il le rend pur et sublime, plus il lui donne de force d'attraction sur l'âme.

Ainsi en est-il, et à plus forte raison, des mystères du christianisme, et, en particulier, du Christ lui-même: si on veut rapprocher de la faible humanité ces réalités transcendantes, on les dégrade; on pense les rendre plus séduisantes en les mettant à notre portée, et on leur enlève, avec leur vérité divine, toute leur prise sur nos âmes. Saint Augustin en avait fait l'expérience: il a raconté comment, avant sa conversion, il se représentait le Christ comme un homme d'une sagesse incomparable; il avait pleinement saisi son humanité; il confessait même sa naissance virginale; mais il ignorait sa nature divine: ce maître purement humain n'avait pas d'empire sur lui. Son ami Alypius s'était laissé prendre à une autre erreur: il croyait que la christologie catholique, c'était celle qu'avait imaginée Apollinaire: il n'y avait dans le Christ que la divinité et la chair, pas d'âme humaine; et comme cette théorie se heurtait trop manifestement aux récits évangéliques, Alypius ne se portait qu'en hésitant vers la foi chrétienne; mais, quand il eut compris que ces imaginations n'étaient qu'une hérésie condamnée par l'Eglise et que la foi chrétienne était toute différente, il y adhéra avec joie et il y trouva la paix.*

Un peu plus haut, saint Augustin décrit ses premières expériences chrétiennes, son désir de Dieu, son impuissance à l'atteindre, et la vertu souveraine de la médiation du Christ; cette page, si sincère et si ardente, est, elle aussi, pleine d'instruction: " Tu es mon Dieu; c'est vers toi que je soupire jour et nuit; quand j'ai commencé à te connaître, tu m'as saisi; j'ai vu que j'avais quelque chose à voir, mais que je n'étais pas capable de le voir; et ta splendeur a renvoyé dans mes yeux le faible rayon de lumière, et j'ai frémi d'amour et d'effroi; et j'ai trouvé que j'étais loin de toi, dans une région toute dissemblable, et il m'a semblé entendre ta voix, me disant du haut du ciel: Je suis la nourriture des forts; grandis et tu me mangeras; et tu ne me changeras pas en toi, comme la nourriture de ta chair; c'est toi qui seras changé en moi " †. Et un peu plus bas: " Je cherchais comment j'arriverais à acquérir la force de jouir de toi, et je ne le trouvais pas, jusqu'à ce que j'eusse saisi le Médiateur de Dieu et des hommes, l'homme Jésus-Christ, qui est au-dessus de tout, Dieu béni dans tous les siècles; il nous appelle, il nous dit: Je suis la voie de la vérité, et la vie; cette nourriture, que j'étais trop faible pour prendre, il l'a mêlée à notre chair, parce que le Verbe s'est fait chair, pour que votre

* *Confessions*, vii. 19, 25. † *Ibid.*, vii. 10, 16.

Sagesse devînt le lait de notre enfance."* Ailleurs encore, Augustin concentre dans une courte formule cette conception catholique de la médiation du Christ: " In quantum homo, in tantum mediator; in quantum autem Verbum, non medius, quia æqualis Deo et Deus apud Deum et simul unus Deus."† Les Pères Grecs ont eux aussi insisté fortement sur cette théologie: dans ses controverses avec les Ariens, saint Athanase fait valoir constamment cette thèse que, si le Christ n'est pas vraiment Dieu, il n'y a pas pour nous de rédemption, parce qu'il n'y a pas d'union à Dieu: orat. II. 67 (P.G. 26, 289): *εἰ γὰρ κτίσμα ὢν ἐγεγόνει ἄνθρωπος, ἔμενεν οὐδὲν ἧττον ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὥσπερ καὶ ἦν, οὐ συναφθεὶς τῷ θεῷ. ibid.* 69 (293) *εἰ κτίσμα ἦν ὁ Υἱὸς, ἔμενεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲν ἧττον θνητὸς, μὴ συναπτόμενος τῷ θεῷ. cf. ibid.* 70 (296) orat. III. 33 (393), etc.

On comprend par ces textes l'importance vitale que ce dogme christologique a pour nous; quiconque en considère seulement l'élaboration technique, est parfois tenté de tout réduire à des controverses byzantines, où des concepts se heurtent dans les nues; si l'on veut être plus équitable et plus perspicace, que l'on regarde ce que devient le christianisme, selon que l'on s'attache à l'une ou à l'autre de ces christologies. Le terme idéal que poursuit notre religion, toute religion, c'est l'union à Dieu, non pas à une divinité amoindrie, mais au vrai Dieu, au Dieu vivant. Si nous professons le dogme des deux natures, cette union nous apparaît dans le Christ pleinement consommée: en lui nous adorons la plénitude de la divinité, et en même temps nous reconnaissons notre humanité toute entière, avec toutes ses limitations, toutes ses faiblesses, sauf le péché. Dès lors, cette union divine, que nous poursuivons, ne nous apparaît plus comme une chimère unissant dans un composé impossible deux termes inconciliables, tellement ils sont éloignés l'un de l'autre; c'est une réalité, que notre foi saisit dans le Christ Jésus. Ce n'est pas non plus un rêve, qui peut enthousiasmer notre imagination, mais qui désespère notre faiblesse; c'est le terme où le Christ nous appelle et où sa grâce nous portera, si nous le voulons.

Supposons au contraire que, rebutés par le dogme des deux natures, nous cherchions à expliquer la grandeur unique du Christ par quelque autre hypothèse: quelle que soit celle que nous choisissions, la médiation du Christ est dénaturée et perd toute sa valeur religieuse: dans le monophysisme, l'humanité s'évanouit; nous ne reconnaissons plus dans le Christ Jésus un homme semblable à nous, et rien ne nous fait espérer que

* *Confessions*, vii. 18, 24.

† *Ibid.*, x. 43, 68. Dans leur note sur ce passage, MM. Gibb et Montgomery remarquent justement l'importance que saint Augustin attache à cette conception de la médiation du Christ, et comparent de *Ciuit. Dei*, ix. 15, et *Serm.* ccxciii. 7.

notre humanité puisse s'unir à Dieu sans s'absorber et se perdre en lui. Si, au contraire, nous voulons expliquer la divinité du Seigneur par un simple contact de Jésus et de Dieu, par une habitation privilégiée de l'Esprit-Saint en l'âme humaine du Christ, l'union est brisée: cet homme, qui est l'idéal de l'humanité et en qui sont concentrés tous nos espoirs, ne nous présente pas en sa personne cette union où nous aspirons; comment alors oserons-nous encore y prétendre ? Il pourra être un serviteur fidèle de Dieu, un prophète, un second Moïse; il ne peut pas être le Médiateur de Dieu et des hommes; et si Lui ne l'est pas, nul ne le sera.

C'est là aussi que conduit la théologie de la rédemption, et d'une façon très pressante. " Dieu fait paraître son amour pour nous en ce que, quand nous étions encore pécheurs, le Christ est mort pour nous " (Rom. v. 8). " Il n'a pas épargné son propre Fils, mais l'a livré pour nous tous; comment donc ne nous donnera-t-il pas tout avec lui ?" (*ibid.* viii. 32). Toute la valeur de cet argument dépend de la relation qui unit Dieu au Christ: si cette preuve d'amour est décisive, c'est que celui que Dieu a livré était son propre Fils.* Et cette mort sanglante du Christ n'est pas seulement la preuve de l'amour que Dieu nous porte; elle est aussi et d'abord le prix de notre salut: " Nous sommes justifiés dans son sang "; " nous avons la rédemption par son sang "; " nous étions jadis loin; nous avons été rapprochés dans le sang du Christ." Tous ces effets admirables, que saint Paul ne se lasse pas d'exalter, ne se comprennent que par la vertu divine du sang du Christ; tout nous ramène à l'exhortation qu'adressait aux chrétiens l'auteur de la IIa. Clementis: " Frères, nous devons considérer Jésus-Christ comme Dieu, comme le juge des vivants et des morts, et nous ne devons pas peu estimer notre salut. Si nous n'avons de Jésus qu'une pauvre idée, nous n'espérons non plus recevoir de Lui que de faibles biens." Et d'autre part, si nous oublions l'humanité du Christ, que devient la théologie paulinienne du second Adam, du Chef de tous les hommes ?

Ainsi ce dogme de la rédemption, sous quelque aspect qu'on l'envisage, a toujours été et est encore aujourd'hui la sauvegarde la plus assurée de la christologie: il faut que le Christ soit Dieu pour que son sacrifice ait la valeur infinie que Dieu exige; il faut que le Christ soit homme pour que, en lui, l'humanité soit sauvée. Le Dr. Relton écrit très justement (p. 162): " The more the doctrine of a Suffering God is taken as a key to the interpretation of the doctrine of the Atonement,

* *Cf.* la note de MM. Sanday et Headlam sur ce passage: " Gifford excellently remarks that the ' proof of God's love towards us drawn from the death of Christ is strong in proportion to the closeness of the union between God and Christ." It is the death of One who is nothing less than " the Son."

the clearer will be the realization that " God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself," and the clearer, consequently, will be the realization of the essential Divinity and humanity of the God-Man." Nul n'a plus fortement exprimé cette vérité fondamentale que Newman dans son bel hymne:

" O wisest love ! that flesh and blood
Which did in Adam fail,
Should strive afresh against the foe,
Should strive and should prevail;

" And that a higher gift than grace
Should flesh and blood refine,
God's presence and His very Self,
And Essence all divine."

Bien des fois, depuis les origines de la théologie chrétienne, on s'est essayé à résoudre le problème en éliminant l'un des deux termes. Tantôt, sous l'influence d'une gnose idéaliste qui méprise la chair et n'y voit qu'un principe mauvais, qu'une source de péché, on se laisse entraîner au docétisme: on veut effacer de l'histoire du Christ vivant sur terre, ou du moins du Christ ressuscité, toute réalité matérielle, visible et tangible: contre ces spéculations hautaines saint Jean proteste et saint Ignace et saint Irénée: la chair est vraiment capable de salut, et elle a été vraiment sauvée dans le Christ; c'est vraiment la chair tombée en Adam, qui s'est relevée dans le Christ, qui a lutté de nouveau, qui a vaincu. D'autres, au contraire, veulent interpréter la divinité du Christ comme une grâce semblable à celle que nous recevons tous, mais plus abondante, plus féconde. Quand cet adoptianisme rationaliste se produisit à la fin du second siècle, on sait quelle réaction il provoqua dans l'Eglise: on ne s'embarrassa pas des syllogismes conjonctifs ou disjonctifs dans lesquels il se complaisait; on en appela au témoignage de l'Ecriture et de l'authentique tradition de l'Eglise: " Qui ne connaît les livres d'Irénée, de Méliton et des autres, où il est proclamé que la Christ est Dieu et homme ?"* Aujourd'hui encore toute tentative adoptianiste se heurtera à ces premières données de notre foi: il y a dans le Christ " a higher gift than grace."†

Mais cette critique des théories que nous rejetons nous ramène simplement à l'affirmation des données élémentaires de notre foi: le Christ est Dieu et homme. Cette affirmation, nous dit-on, doit être non le terme de notre enquête, mais son point de départ; ce qu'on attend du théologien, ce n'est pas le simple énoncé de ces données que tout chrétien répète, c'est leur in-

* Ap. Euseb., *Hist. eccl.*, v. 28.

† Relton, p. 191: " Applying these considerations to the Christological problem, we have also here the deathblow to all Adoptionist Theories, whether ancient or modern. No man, however divinely endowed or inspired, can ever become anything but man." *Cf. id.*, pp. 209-10, la critique de la théorie du Dr. Sanday.

terprétation rationnelle. C'est là que tend surtout l'effort du Dr. Relton, et il faut l'en louer. Toutefois il ne faut point oublier les relations essentielles de la théologie et de la foi: pour l'âme qui croit, c'est un besoin de rechercher l'interprétation rationnelle de sa foi; c'est un bonheur d'y réussir; mais ce serait une témérité et un désastre de déformer ces données pour pouvoir les interpréter plus aisément. Il est des esprits qui se complaisent tellement dans l'harmonie de leurs constructions, qu'ils sacrifient sans grande peine leurs connaissances les plus précieuses aux nécessités rigides de leur système; ils se consolent de moins savoir, s'ils croient à ce prix mieux comprendre. Cet état d'esprit, de dilettantisme philosophique ou historique, implique vis à vis des mystères de Dieu une grande indifférence, et nul chrétien ne saura s'y complaire: les données de la foi sont si précieuses, si nécessaires, non seulement à notre vie individuelle, mais à la vie collective de l'Eglise, que c'est une grande faute et une lourde responsabilité que d'en sacrifier la moindre parcelle aux exigences d'un système. Si donc, ayant reconnu à la lumière de l'Ecriture sainte et de la tradition de l'Eglise que le Christ est Dieu et homme, nous nous trouvions hors d'état de donner de ce mystère une interprétation qui pût nous satisfaire, mieux vaudrait cent fois renoncer au plaisir des spéculations théologiques que de rien sacrifier du dépôt divin.

Mais pareille option ne nous est pas imposée. Une étude attentive de la christologie traditionnelle et des difficultés qu'on lui oppose nous fait constater au contraire que, dans le dogme catholique, il y a des obscurités sans doute, mais non des contradictions, tandis que, dans les hypothèses factices qu'on essaie de lui substituer, les incohérences sont visibles.

Une des difficultés les plus graves est celle du dualisme, que créerait, dit-on, le dogme des deux natures. Dans un long passage du Dr. Mackintosh (cité p. 113-115), cette objection est mise en œuvre avec une grande force:

"The doctrine of the two natures, in its traditional form, imports into the life of Christ an incredible and thoroughgoing dualism. In place of that perfect unity which is felt in every impression of Him, the whole is bisected sharply by the fissure of distinction. No longer one, He is divided against Himself."

Si cette impression était fondée, elle constituerait contre la doctrine traditionelle une objection décisive; il est sûr, en effet, que rien n'est plus sensible dans l'Evangile que l'unité du Christ. Mais, si on l'étudie attentivement, il apparaît que cette unité est consacrée et non compromise par la doctrine des deux natures. Personne, à coup sûr, ne sera tenté aujourd'hui

de mettre en doute la réalité de l'humanité du Christ: elle éclate dans tout l'Evangile, et avec une vérité si évidente, que nul homme ne peut s'y tromper. D'autre part, l'action divine dans cette vie est également manifeste: c'est la vertu divine qui resplendit dans les miracles, c'est la sagesse divine qu'on admire dans les discours, c'est la bonté divine qui s'épanouit dans les œuvres de miséricorde, dans le pardon offert et accordé aux pécheurs. Mais ces deux éléments se pénètrent tellement qu'on ne peut les isoler l'un de l'autre; ainsi que saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie aimait à le dire, l'humanité du Christ est un charbon ardent, intimement pénétré par la chaleur divine. Et cette pénétration nous apparaît parfaite dès le premier jour de la vie du Christ: dans les grands saints de l'humanité, prophètes, apôtres, contemplatifs, nous saisissons les progrès laborieux de la vie divine: c'est une force supérieure qui les envahit peu à peu, mais qui ne s'assujettit pas sans résistance leur vie individuelle; au premier éblouissement de cette lumière, tous ressentent ce frisson, si vivement rendu par saint Augustin dans le passage rappelé plus haut: " Contremui amore et horrore." C'est le cri d'Isaïe, quand il eut la vision de Iahvé sans le temple: " Malheur à moi ! je suis perdu; car je suis un homme aux lèvres impures, j'habite au milieu d'un peuple aux lèvres impures; et c'est le Roi Iahvé des armées qu'ont vu mes veux !" (Is. vi. 5). Parfois même on les voit se raidir contre cette parole divine, qu'ils cherchent à étouffer dans leur sein et qui les brûle: " Tu m'as séduit, Iahvé, et je me suis laissé séduire; tu étais le plus fort, et tu as triomphé ! . . . Je me suis dit: Je n'y penserai plus, en son nom je ne parlerai plus ! Et c'était dans mon sein comme un feu dévorant, enfermé dans mes os: je m'épuisais à le contenir, et je ne pouvais le porter " (Jér. xx. 7-9). Même quand l'âme n'oppose aucune résistance, même quand des grâces surhumaines l'ont déjà fortifiée, elle ne peut sans défaillir porter le poids de la gloire divine: tout ce qu'en peut dire saint Paul, c'est qu'il fut ravi dans le paradis et qu'il y entendit des paroles ineffables (2 Cor. xii. 2-4). Toutes ces âmes d'élite, qui sont la gloire de l'humanité, ont senti l'infinie distance qui les séparait de Dieu; elles ont frémi à sa présence, elles ont été éblouies de sa splendeur. Dans le Christ Jésus, rien de tel: vie, lumière, sainteté, tout ce qui est divin n'a point à l'envahir, c'est son être; c'est l'atmosphère naturelle dans laquelle il pense, il veut, il agit. Les révélations qu'il nous fait sont incomparablement plus hautes que celles des prophètes ou des apôtres; nulle ne l'étonne, nulle ne l'éblouit, nulle ne produit ni frémissement dans sa pensée, ni hésitation dans sa parole. " On le voit plein des secrets de Dieu; mais on voit qu'il n'en est point étonné, comme les autres mortels à

qui Dieu se communique; il en parle naturellement, comme étant né dans ce secret et dans cette gloire."*

C'est cette paisible possession des trésors divins, c'est cette aisance si naturelle au sein des mystères les plus sublimes, qui donne au Christ, tel que les évangiles le font connaître, son unité morale; et cette unité n'est point compromise par le dogme de deux natures: elle n'est expliquée que par lui: ces deux éléments de la vie du Christ sont si intimement fondus en sa personne qu'il faut chercher le principe de cette unité à la racine même de son être. Si l'on ne veut voir dans sa vertu divine que l'effet d'une action supérieure qui se serait répandue en lui plus abondamment sans doute que dans les autres hommes, mais qui cependant ne serait qu'une grâce départie par le Créateur à un cœur d'homme, on fera violence à l'Evangile et on brisera l'unité du Christ. Si l'on ne veut pas le diviser, si l'on veut redire en toute vérité: " Je crois en un seul Seigneur, Jésus-Christ," il faut confesser l'unité personnelle qui vit et agit dans ces deux natures.

Cette conclusion est aussi celle où parvient le Dr. Relton à la fin de son enquête: une seule Personne, celle du Fils de Dieu, possédant deux natures, l'une divine, l'autre humaine. Pour donner de ce mystère une interprétation plus précise, il recourt à l'explication proposée par Léonce de Byzance, puis par saint Jean Damascène: la nature humaine, dans le Christ, n'est pas une ὑπόστασις; elle n'est pas non plus ἀνυπόστατος; elle est ἐνυπόστατος, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ὑποστᾶσα. L'explication est excellente; une seule chose surprend ici le lecteur: c'est que le Dr. Relton semble croire que cette théorie a disparu de l'enseignement théologique depuis l'époque de saint Jean Damascène; c'est au contraire l'explication unanimement proposée par les théologiens catholiques. Saint Thomas d'Aquin, pour me contenter de cet exemple, prouve longuement que l'union du Verbe incarné n'a pu se faire dans la nature: en effet ou les deux natures auraient conservé leur intégrité, et il n'y aurait point entre elles une véritable union substantielle, mais seulement une juxtaposition, un assemblage; ou bien l'une d'elles eût été transformée et mêlée dans l'autre: mais cette transformation est évidemment impossible pour la nature divine; elle ne l'est pas moins pour la nature humaine, infiniment distante de la nature divine et qui ne peut se changer en elle; le Christ, d'ailleurs, ne serait plus dans cette hypothèse ni Dieu ni homme. Dans l'article suivant, il expose comment l'union s'est faite dans

* Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire universelle*, ii. 19. Pascal avait déjà fait une remarque semblable: " Le riche parle bien des richesses; le roi parle froidement d'un grand don qu'il vient de faire, et Dieu parle bien de Dieu " (*Pensées*, édit. Brunschvicg, 799).

la personne du Verbe. Un peu plus loin, il reprend toute l'histoire de la question, rappelle les hérésies contraires des monophysites et des Nestoriens, puis les essais maladroits et malheureux de ceux qui, tout en voulant sauvegarder l'unité de personne, ont cru pouvoir imaginer deux hypostases (hypostases) ou deux suppots (supposita), et il conclut: " Fides autem catholica medium inter prædictas positiones tenens, non dicit unionem factam Dei et hominis secundum essentiam vel naturam, neque etiam secundum accidens, sed medio modo secundum subsistentiam seu hypostasim."* Des principes ainsi posés il n'y aura plus qu'à tirer la conclusion; on peut la recueillir dans cette même partie de la Somme, un peu plus bas (qu. XVII., art. 2); saint Thomas se demande si, dans le Christ, il y a unum esse; il répond ainsi: " Il est nécessaire que ce qui appartient à la nature, soit double dans le Christ; et que ce qui appartient à l'hypostase, soit unique"; par conséquent, si l'on considère " l'existence (esse) qui appartient à l'hypostase ou à la personne en tant que telle, il est impossible que cette existence soit multiple dans une seule hypostase ou une seule personne, parce qu'il est impossible qu'une seule chose n'ait pas une seule existence. . . . En conséquence, puisque la nature humaine est unie au Fils de Dieu hypostatiquement ou personnellement, comme il a été dit plus haut, et non pas accidentellement, il s'ensuit que (le Fils de Dieu) ne reçoit pas selon la nature humaine une nouvelle existence personnelle, mais seulement une nouvelle relation de son existence personnelle préexistante à la nature humaine; de sorte qu'on doive dire que cette personne (du Fils de Dieu) subsiste désormais, non seulement selon la nature divine, mais selon la nature humaine."

On retrouve dans cette thèse, avec une précision métaphysique un peu plus grande, la position de saint Jean Damascène: la nature humaine, dans le Christ, n'est pas une personne; elle n'est pas non plus impersonnelle; mais elle subsiste dans la personne du Fils de Dieu. Tous les théologiens catholiques contemporains exposent de même, avec plus ou moins de vigueur, le dogme christologique.†

L'auteur de cet article aurait un grand plaisir à arrêter ici la discussion et a féliciter le Dr. Relton d'avoir rejoint, inconsciemment peut-être, le groupe des théologiens scolastiques, médiévaux et modernes: ne retrouve-t-on pas, de part et d'autre, la même doctrine de l'" enhypostasia " ? Il est vrai, on l'y

* *Summa Theol.*, III*a*, qu. II., art. 1, 2, 6.

† Il suffira de citer le Cardinal Billot, *De Verbo Incarnato* (ed. 4*a*. Romae, 1904), p. 93 *sqq*. et p. 285 *sqq*. Le seul dissentiment notable qu'il faille relever est d'ordre métaphysique: les théologiens qui ne reconnaissent pas une distinction réelle entre l'essence (essentia) et l'existence (esse), admettent dans le Christ deux existences, l'une divine et l'autre humaine.

retrouve, mais interprétée selon deux philosophies différentes: après avoir exposé le système de Léonce de Byzance, le Dr. Relton s'efforce de le détacher des catégories aristotéliciennes d'où il est né (82). Il suffit au contraire de relire les passages de saint Thomas transcrits ci-dessus pour constater que chez lui le péripatétisme reste vivant. De part et d'autre, on parlera de personne et d'hypostase, mais sans donner aux mêmes mots exactement la même valeur: pour les scolastiques, la conception sera avant tout d'ordre métaphysique; pour beaucoup de nos contemporains, elle sera avant tout psychologique; en conséquence, saint Thomas fera porter tout son effort sur l'unité de la subsistance personnelle; M. Relton, sur l'unité de la conscience: " Upon no other theory can we continue to speak of His having possessed Two Natures, and yet as having had but a single consciousness " (p. 268). Cette conception est étrangère à Léonce de Byzance, à saint Jean Damascène; elle l'est tout autant aux scolastiques, et, avouons-le, à l'auteur de ces pages. Sans aucun doute il y a dans le Christ un seul Sujet conscient, mais non une seule conscience, pas plus qu'une seule volonté ou une seule science; toutes ces opérations de connaissance ou de vouloir procèdent immédiatement de la nature et, selon le principe de saint Thomas rappelé ci-dessus, " necesse est quod ea quæ ad naturam pertinent in Christo sint duo." Mais, pour discuter cela, il faudrait plus qu'un article; contentons-nous de reconnaître la diversité des philosophies et la divergence qu'elles impliquent dans l'interprétation du dogme.*

Il eût été peu loyal de voiler cette divergence; il serait très fâcheux de l'exagérer. Les réserves qu'on peut faire sur l'interprétation du dogme sont secondaires, quand le dogme lui-même, tel qu'il apparaît, par exemple, dans la définition de Chalcédoine, est dans ce livre l'objet d'une défense si sincère et si vigoureuse. On voudrait pouvoir transcrire ici tout le dernier chapitre, consacré au Christ de l'histoire et au Christ de l'expérience (p. 236-274). Il est difficile d'exposer avec plus de force la divinité du Christ, telle qu'elle apparaît dans l'Evangile, telle quelle se manifeste dans l'œuvre du salut, telle enfin que la professe la foi vivante de l'Eglise.

Tout récemment un professeur de l'Université de Princeton, le Rev. Dr. Machen, après avoir exposé les systèmes imaginés pour interpréter le paulinisme, concluait: " The fundamental

* Nous aurions à faire de semblables réserves sur la conception même de Dieu. Le Dr. Relton insiste avec beaucoup de raison sur ce que Dieu est amour; mais il en conclut (p. 57, 160) que Dieu n'est pas impassible, qu'il est susceptible de souffrir; si tout cela doit s'entendre seulement de la nature humaine du Christ, nul ne saura y faire d'objection; il n'en ira pas de même, si l'on veut dire que nul amour, même en Dieu, ne peut s'entendre sans souffrance, sans passion. Le Dr. Relton attaque sur ce point saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie; nous ne voyons pas que ces attaques soient justifiées.

difficulty in explaining the origin of Paulinism will never disappear by being ignored; it will never yield to compromises of any kind. It will disappear only when Jesus is recognized as being really what Paul presupposes Him to be and what all the Gospels represent Him as being—the eternal Son of God, come to earth for the redemption of man, now seated once more on the throne of His glory, and working in the hearts of His disciples through His Spirit, as only God can work. Such a solution was never so unpopular as it is to-day. Acceptance of it will involve a Copernican revolution in many departments of human thought and life. But refusal of such acceptance has left an historical problem which so far has not been solved." *

Si cette solution est repoussée, ce n'est pas seulement l'exégèse et l'histoire qui s'embarrassent de difficultés insolubles; c'est la vie de tous les chrétiens, c'est la vie de l'Eglise qui se perd sans espoir. Il est trop vrai que cette solution est impopulaire en dehors des milieux catholiques, ce nous sera un nouveau motif de féliciter le Dr. Relton d'avoir si courageusement défendu cette thèse vitale, et de l'avoir fait avec tant de talent.

JULES LEBRETON.

THE CRITICAL WORK OF JOHANNES WEISS†

(I.)

IT might have been expected that so considerable a scholar as Johannes Weiss would have left behind him some friend or pupil who would tell the story of his life and attempt some estimate of his character and work. But Weiss died in August, 1914, and in the terrible happenings of that fateful time his death passed almost unregarded. Enquiries made in Germany, with the kind help of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, elicited the reply that Frau Weiss herself knew of only one article which she felt to be a worthy tribute to her husband's memory, and that this was the work of an Englishman.‡ I can do little, therefore, to amplify or illustrate the outline of facts and dates which are already on record.

Johannes Weiss was born in 1863 at Kiel, where Bernhard Weiss, his father, was Professor of New Testament Exegesis. Born and bred in the atmosphere of Biblical scholarship, he owed much to his father's inspiration and teaching. His abiding sense of this debt is expressed in the Preface to *Das älteste*

* *The Origin of Paul's Religion.* New York: Macmillan, 1921, p. 312.

† Part of two lectures delivered at Oxford in June, 1922, at the invitation of Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, by H. N. Bate, M.A., Canon of Carlisle.

‡ F. C. Burkitt, "Johannes Weiss, In Memoriam," *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1915.

Evangelium (1902), which was dedicated to the elder Weiss in commemoration of his jubilee as a Professor:

"A generation ago, in 1872, my father dedicated his book on St. Mark's Gospel to his father, in commemoration of his fiftieth year of office. I do the same to-day. It may indeed be open to question whether my father and teacher will find great pleasure in the book which I offer him. It is possible that he, and many others with him, will be more strongly impressed by the points at which I diverge from him than by the ground which we have in common. I can only say that in this sphere of study I have learnt from no one so much as from him, and that it is a pleasure to me to find myself more and more strongly convinced of the soundness of his judgment upon points of cardinal importance. That I accept, while he rejects, the hypothesis of an Ur-Marcus is of little significance in comparison with the great point in which we concur—namely, that we both hold the text of Mark to be at many points less original than that of Matthew or Luke, and hold also that Mark made use of Q, and even took portions of his narrative from it. But, above all, in the study of the literary and dogmatic character of the Gospel, as also in the attempt to go back to its sources, I believe myself to be continuing a thread which my father was the first to spin."

Weiss, whose life was not destined to be a long one, came early into the full possession of his powers. He was at Göttingen from 1884 to 1895, and obtained a professorship there in 1890, when he was no more than twenty-seven years old. Leaving Göttingen in 1895, he held a chair at Marburg for thirteen years; and the last seven years of his life were spent at Heidelberg, where he succeeded Adolf Deissmann in 1908.

While yet a student, Weiss had already begun to work at the problems with which his name was to be most closely connected, and had written an essay on the "Idea of the Kingdom of God in Theology." In 1892 he published the little book which brought the problem of eschatology into the fore-front of critical enquiry—*Die Predigt Jesu von Reiche Gottes*. In its original form it was little more than a pamphlet, issued as a flaming challenge to Liberal Protestantism. It is now very hard to obtain a copy of that pamphlet. Weiss, I imagine, did not wish it to survive. The second edition, issued in 1900, is a very different book—not a challenge, but a work of considered judgments, restating the eschatological view in the light of criticism.

In the history of New Testament scholarship the name of Weiss will always be connected with that turn of the tide which began in 1892. Professor Burkitt's memorial study is entirely

devoted to the two editions of *Die Predigt Jesu*. But it would be an injustice to a many-sided scholar if it were forgotten that Weiss achieved high excellence in many parts of the field of New Testament study. I propose, therefore, to call attention here to some aspects of his work which have not, as yet, attracted all the attention which they deserve.

Four of his books, apart from the *Predigt Jesu*, have already some measure of standing in England, and some hope of survival: the analytic study of St. Mark (*Das älteste Evangelium*), to which I shall return later; the commentaries on St. Luke and 1 Corinthians, in the latest edition of Meyer-Weiss' Commentary; and the great posthumous and unfinished work *Das Urchristenthum*, the second volume of which was completed by Dr. Rudolf Knopf, of Bonn, and published in 1917. But from a long list of minor works I should wish to single out two for special mention. In 1897 Weiss published a study of the purpose and literary character of the Acts of the Apostles. Both Professor Burkitt and M. Maurice Goguel concur in regarding this brief essay as marking the end and the beginning of a period in the history of criticism. "It appeared," says Professor Burkitt, "at a time when the reconstruction and reconsideration of lost sources seemed almost the only occupation of the up-to-date New Testament investigator." "Johannes Weiss' work," says M. Goguel, "may be considered as having closed the period in which the search for lost sources was the sole preoccupation of the student: but its merit is far from being merely negative. In so far as he directed the attention of exegetical enquiry to the discovery of the author's intentions, he may be said to have moved backwards in the direction of Tübingen. But side by side with this the programme outlined by Johannes Weiss has an element of real novelty: it is that he invites attention to the literary characteristics of the book. Thus a new phase in the criticism of Acts is opened, in which the literary character and the historical value of the narrative are scrutinized together. The point of view from which the book is regarded grows wider, and ceases to be narrowly theological: and together with this expansion of the problem there comes the corresponding gain that men who are not exegetes by profession, but classical and historical scholars, such as Schwartz, Wellhausen, Wendland, and Norden, make important contributions to the study of Acts."

The ground thus covered by Weiss is worked over again in the first volume of *Das Urchristenthum*. But another study which also appeared in 1897, *Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik*, represents the results of work which,so far as I know, Weiss did not carry beyond the point then reached; and it calls for special

notice both because it deals with a type of enquiry for which Weiss was peculiarly well qualified, and because its method and results are clearly capable of fruitful extension in competent hands.

Weiss was, as I should infer, a man of fine and delicate artistic perception: a good judge of values alike in form and in matter. As an exegete he was, if anything, over-scrupulous, over-sensitive in perceiving shades of feeling and intention in the text before him: he could be trusted to keep himself always in touch with the most delicate variations in his author's mood. And to a keen sense of colour he added a robust sense of form, which was reflected alike in his own admirable prose style and in his work as a critic of the written word. Hence such studies as those of Wendland on Early Christian literary forms and Norden's Antike Kunstprosa were peculiarly congenial to his mind.

In a lecture given to a clerical society at Karlsruhe in 1908 (*Die Aufgaben der ntl. Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart*, pp. 16 *f.*)—a lecture in which a convenient summary of Weiss' own contribution to the study of literary structure may be found—he laments the distaste with which the study of form in the New Testament is commonly regarded. "The very word 'rhetoric' is repulsive to every right-minded man who firmly believes that *pectus facit theologium*. It suggests to him at once an empty jingle of words, and he rejoices in the conviction that it is content, rather than form, that really matters." And yet "we can never form a complete estimate of a great historical movement like Christianity if we enquire only into its leading ideas; we must also see and feel why the particular form of utterance in which the new force expresses itself was able to work with such creative power."

The *Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik* exemplify the application of these principles to the Pauline Epistles. In an essay on the Pauline conception of freedom Weiss threw fresh light on the relation between the substance of St. Paul's ethical teaching and that of the Stoic preachers: here he is concerned with questions of form, and sets himself to show that in respect of his technical equipment as a writer St. Paul was a student, or rather an accomplished master, of Stoic modes of expression.

Weiss' essay includes an exhaustive analytic study of the Epistle to the Romans, and with this it ends: leaving thus an unfinished task which it would be well if a well-trained hand could continue. In particular it would be desirable, if the literary methods discernible in such Epistles as Romans and Corinthians exhibit features susceptible of some degree of scientific classification, that the criteria which such analysis supplies should be applied, let us say, to the Colossian letter

first, then to the Ephesians, and after this to the Pastoral Epistles. I do not suggest that in the case of a mind and a pen so versatile as that of St. Paul the mere analysis of stylistic method is capable of yielding definite dogmatic results: it is certain that negative results based upon such data would be more than precarious. But I do suggest that in the case of the Ephesian letter, for instance, a case in which critics are peculiarly apt to allow an undue weight to subjective considerations, a really close analysis of style, following on a similar scrutiny as applied to Colossians, might yield valuable results of a less subjective kind. It would be, to say the least, interesting if the application of tests which Johannes Weiss has added to the critic's outfit should be found to lead in a direction unfavourable to that rather over-definite rejection of Ephesians to which Weiss was himself inclined. In any case, the experiment is worth making.

I turn now to the consideration of Weiss' critical work on the Gospels. And here I must begin by admitting the incompleteness of my studies. I have not had the opportunity of working through the commentary on St. Luke, in the last edition of Meyer-Weiss' Commentary, nor have I read, as I should have wished to do, *Die Nachfolge Christi und die Predigt der Gegenwart* (1895), which would have enabled me to form a clearer view of Weiss' judgment upon the ethical results of thoroughgoing eschatology. Further, I have only been able to give a passing glance to the translation and exposition of the Synoptists in *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments neu übersetzt*, etc. That presentation of the New Testament text in German speech, together with an interpretation designed for well-educated readers and embodying the results of German criticism, was Weiss' chief popular contribution to New Testament study. An Englishman, contemplating these four well-packed volumes, of which many thousands of copies have been sold, may well wonder whether it would not be possible to make the best results of English scholarship accessible to our own people on similar lines. Here is a complete exposition of the New Testament, now in its third edition, revised after Weiss' death by Bousset and Heitmüller; it has sold, and is still selling. Shall we look to the very limited number of our competent scholars, or to the timidity of the English publisher, to explain the fact that nothing of the sort has been attempted in our own country ?

Apart, then, from an equally popular and entirely conclusive demolition of those perversions of sound history which are linked with the names of Kalthoff, Drews, Jensen, J. M. Robertson, and, we must regretfully add, Sir J. G. Frazer, and one or two other " exoteric " essays, my reading has been confined to *Das älteste Evangelium* and *Die Predigt Jesu von Reiche Gottes*.

The first impression which these works have left upon my mind is that they came from the pen of a man who, with all the true scholar's modesty and critical self-restraint, had a thorough belief in his work, a great happiness in doing it, and a strong faith in the possibility of real progress in New Testament study. One may attribute to him two qualities which he regarded as essential to the student—he was a *wahrheitsliebender* and an *arbeitsfroher Mann*. In respect of the life of our Lord, he had no tincture of scepticism. "There is no ground," he wrote, "for resigning ourselves to the belief that we shall never know. . . . The material which lies before us is inexhaustible in its variety, wonderful in its beauty and wealth; we have only to compare it with the poverty of that which scholars allow themselves to use as a basis for the life of Buddha in order to feel how rich we are."

The type of study from which Weiss expected the best results, and upon which he spent the greatest part of his own labour, was that of regressive analysis. He regarded the history of the New Testament, its text and substance, like that of the Church which created it, as dividing itself naturally into certain well-marked stages, from any one of which it was possible to work backwards. Thus, in respect of the New Testament text, on which, perhaps, he would not have claimed to have more than a general right to speak, he taught that the most crucial moment or stage in the history of Gospels and Epistles alike was that at which the separate documents were brought together as Εὐαγγέλιον and Ἀπόστολος. It ought to be possible, he held, to recover first of all a text which would represent something very like that of the earliest *corpus* of Gospels and of Epistles. But if such a text were constituted, it would have to be taken, not as the ultimate goal of textual study, but as the starting-point for fufther analysis. The *corpus Paulinum* would be found to show the marks of the ecclesiastical editor's hand. It would not give us the letters as they were read to the Christians of Corinth or Philippi. But it might be possible to get back a little further towards the originals. In particular, we might discover how far the text of the Epistles has been modified by the process of harmonization, and by other modes of adaptation for general use in the Churches. Possible instances of such a process are not uncommon,—*e.g.*, in 2 Cor. xiii. 10, we read Διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὼν γράφω ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκέν μοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν, a sentence in which no word is superfluous or out of place. But in 2 Cor. x. 8, ἐάν τε γὰρ περισσότερον καυχήσωμαι περὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἡμῶν ἧς ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς

καθαίρεσιν ὑμῶν, οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, the words common to this place and xiii. 8, have a certain awkwardness, and it is conceivable that they had no place in the original text. In Rom. i. 16, again, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, the word πρῶτον is, to say the least, unessential: and the conjecture that it has crept in from ii. 9, 10 would in any case be plausible. The omission of the word by B.G. Tert. may be taken to make it certain. Or, to take an example of another type, an example in which ecclesiastical modification is suggested, the address of 1 Corinthians, which in the existing text is extended far beyond the limits of Corinth to " all who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in every place," does not look, on the surface at least, as if it were original. Weiss held, therefore, that in the reconstruction of the Pauline text there is room for a type of criticism which will remove from the Epistles, by means of scrupulously disciplined conjecture, such traces of redaction as these.

In the case of the Gospels, the task lying before textual critics, as Weiss conceived it, is more difficult in some ways, easier in others. It is more easy, at least in so far as it involves the detecting of harmonization and the like, because in the Gospels two or more relatively similar forms of practically the same text have to be compared, in order to decide which is the more original, and which of the Gospels has been corrupted by harmonization with the other: whereas in the Epistles the problems presented are far less definite and the room for conjecture is all too ample. It is more difficult because the textual history of the Gospels is in itself far more complex than that of the Epistles. Yet the problem of both groups of books was for Weiss fundamentally the same: that is, to determine, even approximately, the earliest form of what we may call the ecclesiastical text—*i.e.*, in the case of the Gospels, the text of the earliest Euangelion Tetramorphon—and then to work back from this towards the rediscovery of those countless points of individuality in each Gospel which either unconscious memory, that great harmonizer, or deliberate purpose has blurred or obliterated. And in this process, great as were the results which Weiss, like the rest of the world, expected from the study of Western authorities—I note especially his reliance on the work of Merx upon the Syriac texts—he clearly looked forward towards, and even anticipated, a stage in the story of textual discovery at which the study of authors might become more important than the study of readings—*i.e.*, at which the sum-total of purely textual evidence might have been recorded and appraised—and readings might come to be regarded as original on the strength of purely internal considerations, supported, by a

weight of MS. authority which thirty years ago would have been regarded as negligible, or perhaps by no MS. authority at all.

The importance of harmonization as a factor in the formation of textual types in the Gospels is, of course, no new theme; but it has received fresh interest from its treatment in the inaugural lecture of Professor C. H. Turner, who, not unlike Weiss in this respect, is prepared to maintain the relative originality of certain readings attested by the old Latin *e* or *k* against the whole mass of other evidence, and also to claim a legitimate place even for conjectural emendation of New Testament texts. But there is one point in Weiss' handling of this factor which deserves particular attention, opening out the way, as it does, to further investigation. It is this—that he asks for a more careful study of the influence of the Fourth Gospel upon the Synoptic text. He points to Matt. xxvii. 49, ἄλλος δὲ λαγὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευραν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, as an obvious instance. Here the whole weight of Western evidence, together with Origen, goes against the "Johannine" insertion. Other instances cited by Weiss appear to call for very careful enquiry. It was in the nature of things, he urges, that as soon as the fourth Gospel came to stand together with the others it should exercise a dominant influence upon the formation of the Gospel text in general. He discerns traces of such influence both in cases where it is directly suggested by the evidence of our *apparatus criticus* and also in certain others. (*a*) He discerns it in at least two places in Luke xxiv.: in xxiv. 12, "Peter rose up and ran to the tomb, and stooping down seeth the linen cloths lying apart, and departed to his own home wondering at that which had come to pass," and in xxiv. 37, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη ὑμῖν; and (*b*) in many passages where Mark stands apparently alone: in the healing of the deaf and dumb man and of the blind man, in the one loaf which the disciples had with them on the lake, in the astonishment of Pilate that Jesus was already dead, in Peter's warming himself at the fire. In these alleged cases from St. Mark it must be remembered that Weiss was a strong believer in the theory of an Ur-Markus: and it is not entirely clear whether he means to suggest that these notable peculiarities of Mark were what we may call tertiary or secondary—*i.e.*, whether they originated in the second century, after the Gospel had reached its almost final stage, and are to be treated as textual variants on a rather abnormally large scale, or whether they are to be credited to the nebulous redactor who, in Weiss' view, revised the Ur-Markus after it had been used by Matthew and Luke. I imagine that he would treat them rather as redactional than as scribal additions: and such a view would suggest both

a very late date for Weiss' redactor and a rather early date for the currency and influence of the fourth Gospel.

I need not follow this further. But the general suggestion of Johannine influence upon the text of Mark, and also, in the cases mentioned, of Luke, opens up a problem which has, and had for Weiss, a peculiar interest. I shall have to return later to Weiss' handling of certain Johannine questions. At this point I only wish to suggest that in the case of Luke, at least, it is wise to be very chary of admitting isolated and sporadic contamination from John: and that because such admissions may prejudice and hamper our consideration of a delicate and, as yet, unsettled question—the question, namely, of the general relation of the Lukan to the Johannine tradition. That relation might prove, and would, I think, on close investigation, prove to be a rather close one: or, I might say, if we could confront Canon Streeter's Proto-Luke with an Ur-Johannes, it would be found that they were fairly near of kin; and the logical order of procedure required by the facts would place first a general investigation of the relationship which I have alleged, and after this the consideration of particular passages such as those which may or may not form part of the original Lukan text of chapter xxiv.

H. N. Bate.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH UNDER THE BOLSHEVIKS

Sacred to the Memory of my Martyred Brother Alexander, Shot by the Bolsheviks in the Town of Uralsk on the Night of June 25/12 to 26/13, 1919, and whose Body was Thrown into the Ural River and never Recovered.

Unto him be eternal memory.

"And the light shineth in darkness."—*St. John* i. 5.

Infinitely calamitous is the fate of Russia. It appears a moral disaster to all who are not yet completely overpowered by purely egoistical pursuits and have still retained a certain amount of human sensitiveness. If the shock of a sudden great joy may sometimes occasion death, no imagination can stand the horrors of socialistic fury let loose. Many are acquainted with and realize this fact, but we must warn them that this overwhelming external aspect is infinitely below the terrible reality. Only a personal experience of this *inferno* may give an adequate idea of its actual frightfulness. Material losses, in spite of their "astronomic" proportions, may, nevertheless, be recovered. In that respect Russia is still the "country of

illimitable possibilities," if only for the reason that her natural wealth is almost untouched.

Until the Revolution of the spring of 1917 the Russian Orthodox Church was united to the State, and was called upon to share in its destinies. It was but natural that the convulsions of the State left her defenceless and helpless against attacks, doomed to disintegration, owing to the absence of props within herself which she had never possessed before, and which it was now too late to put up. Her entire dependence on the State was so profoundly rooted that with the disappearance of governmental guardianship her own downfall seemed inevitable. This was apparently so obvious that even the most loyal admirers felt their trust in "Holy Russia" somewhat shaken, in spite of personal grief at the loss. Mr. Arnold-stan Riley, an intimate friend of the late foreign expert on Russian Orthodoxy and of its mystically fervent adept Mr. Birkbeck, who died suddenly on June 9, 1918, in his fifty-seventh year, nevertheless considered that the latter was *felix opportunitate mortis*, as it was to be apprehended that the Russian aspect of religion and the Church, downtrodden by the Revolution, would have broken his heart. He (i.e., Mr. Riley) holds it as a symptom worthy of note that the name of God in recent official documents is mentioned only in the dignified farewell manifesto of the Tzar Nicholas II., and as early as June, 1917, asks:

"Are Russia's splendid shrines to be destroyed and her Church, which made her great, humbled to the dust? Are all the glory and solemnities to pass away as a dream? *Domine Deus tu nosti*. The author thinks that the weakness of the Church of Russia in the face of these tremendous political changes lies in her strong Byzantine traditions, emanating from a past when the Eastern Church and Empire were closely linked together through the personality of the Emperor. The tendency in later times, notably in the reconstruction of national institutions by Peter the Great, has been to accentuate these traditions and to destroy still further the independence of the Church. Thus, the *modus vivendi* of a 'Free Church in a Free State,' advanced by liberal French Catholics after the French Revolution had put an end to the old ideal of the relation between Church and State, would mean for the Russian Church a complete reversal of her historical growth. Can she adapt herself to altered circumstance—i.e., existence within a neutral or even hostile State? What will be her fate when exposed to the competition of the rival Churches and sects? Nothing just like the present crisis has ever happened to the Eastern Church before; in many ways the fall of Constantinople

and enslavement of the Greek Church by the infidel was an easier shock to withstand. This is the weakness of the Russian Church; her strength lies in the devotion of her people, especially of her peasantry. If her children are not led away by the glamour of material and earthly things; if they still preserve their simple and touching devotion to our Lord, so conspicuous, for instance, in their pilgrimages to the earthly Jerusalem; if they still trust in the protection of His Most Holy Mother, and the fellowship of Jerusalem which is above, then the Church of Russia may launch out boldly into the deep, knowing that from all temptations and troubles allowed by the good God He has provided a way of escape that we may be able to bear them."*

Such an alternative tremulously apprehended by a sympathizing soul was at the beginning of 1919 boldly taken for granted by Roman Catholics, who, after the Revolution, had in relation to Russian Orthodoxy assumed the attitude of the roaring lion (1 Pet. v. 8). Even the most well-disposed French Roman Catholics wrote of the Russian Church: "Suddenly the political system on which it rested collapsed, and the Church found herself free and dispossessed. It has lost many of its faithful—indeed, so many that it might be asked if 'Holy Russia' has not ceased to exist. She has tried, in the midst of widespread indifference, to organize herself, but her best concerted attempts, such as the General Council of Moscow in 1917, have only revealed her powerlessness. After close guardianship for long centuries, habits of independence and liberty cannot be learned in a day."†

What is the actual state of the Russian Church after more than four years of Bolshevist "wrestling against God"? How far and which of their expectations and aspirations have been fulfilled?

After the overwhelming Revolution the destinies of the contemporary Russian Church have been placed in the hands of the people, and that in conformity with the belief of the Orthodox East that "the guardianship of piety is committed to the body of the Church—*i.e.*, to the people itself."‡ And lo! herein awaited disappointment so profound that many persons, particularly Liberals of the "Populist" party, cannot even now recover their senses. The patented *advocatus diaboli*

* Athelstan Riley, *Birkbeck and the Russian Church.* London, 1917. Pp. 359, 361-63.

† Professor S. Calvet, *French Catholics and the Russian Church.* See *The Constructive Quarterly* vii. 1 (March, 1919), p. 41.

‡ Thus says the "Encyclical of the One, Holy, Œcumenical (Catholic) Apostolic Church to all Orthodox Christians," edited in May, 1848, under the Patriarch Anthimus VI. of Constantinople (in reply to the Encyclical of Pope Pius IX., written January 6, 1848, and containing an appeal to Eastern Christians) and accepted in Russia.

of Bolshevism, the writer Maxim Gorky (A. M. Pieshkov), himself of obscure workman origin, is now vociferating furiously against the " blind and unbridled peasantry, the primitive and low-browed beast imbued with instincts of possession," who is " keeping a blood-stained feast of commemoration, drowning our (Russian) cities in blood, destroying wholesale the brain of the nation."* Another literary pigmy of the " Populist " type, a certain V. Mouighel, prates incoherently about the " simple-minded Russian," who, having only now recovered himself, " has become aware that he has overdone it, and the results are not quite up to his expectations. He, like a savage, has rudely thrown off his yoke and shocked the ' cultured ' world, so alien to his own special form of culture; and ' in the fight ' has done that the memory of which makes him now scratch his head."† The pseudo-" Slovophils " from among patriotic reactionaries, who erstwhile were the loudest to sing the praises of the great Orthodox Russian people, and threatened to " do away " with the " rotten West," are now the first to hurl their invectives and, accusing Dostoievsky, call their former idol, not the " bearer of God," but a " bearer of the devil." And numerous profoundly sad events cannot be denied. It seemed as if the billows of some wicked epidemic of insanity had swept over the people, drowning everything in their muddy, seething froth. . . . Their flying spray has tainted the Church and left its dark traces to this day. But this was but an outburst of the epidemic, and has long since lost its acuteness, after demonstrating that the innermost being of the Russian does not correspond to his outward appearance, which absorbs his generosity and distorts his innate nobility into a monstrosity.

In this case the anti-religious socialistic insanity was confined to the more or less narrow circles of the town mob, factory hands, and " green " village youth intoxicated by Communist temptations. The people itself remained almost entirely alien to such abnormal excesses, only did not offer any organized opposition, and did not prevent them, thereby tolerating them. Instead of active resistance, the people preferred to suffer for their religion, thus justifying the words of the poet Nekrassov that they were " a people whose patience amazed the world." The Russian people was always accustomed to live in a " commune " and act " in common," but on Christian principles, and therefore never sympathized with atheist experiments, however tempting their guise. The mass of the people eyed the development of the newly implanted Communism with curiosity as long as the latter seemed compatible with, and issuing

* See the Communist Helsingfors paper *Put*, No. 176, September 20, 1921.
† See same, No. 246, December 11, 1921.

from, Christianity. A certain Liberal, well known in the "official spheres" of Bolshevism, and a complete internationalist, testified to us that the real peasant Russia would only accept Lenin if that brigand hero would appear before her bearing an ikon of Christ in his hands and preceded by a priest with a Crucifix. As these rude, intolerant, and odious Communists never were, nor will be, capable of such an act, Communism has disappeared from the minds of the people even as an object for comparative observation, and has at once become an accursed object of loathing and horror.

The last census of the Communist party has shown that it has lost an enormous number of peasants, also many "intellectuals" and workmen, and in a very great number of cases they left the party for religious motives. This is all the more significant because withdrawal from the Communist party is always followed by specially malicious reprisals, whereas loyalty to Communism is rewarded by great material benefits and a multitude of social and administrative privileges.

Besides these material allurements there were constant spiritual temptations. We do not speak of the direct Socialist-Bolshevist propaganda with which everyone was literally overwhelmed—but even that was disgustingly blatant and earsplitting, and aroused the gradually increasing opposition in the souls of the people. It was supported by the more subtle influence of the fallen or venal "intellectuals," who tried to seduce the conscience of the people by various religiously decadent combinations. A certain Andrei Bely (White), who adopted that colour as an absolute contrast to his own blackness, and who, with his father, the well-known Moscow mathematician N. Bugayev, founded a regular idealistic school—this Lombroso type tried, by means of poisonous rigmaroles, to prove that the Golgotha of Christ was crowned and realized in Jewish-Russian Bolshevism. . . . For this purpose it was necessary to undermine faith in the Church. . . . The Bolsheviks launched a veritable attack on the latter, so as to stun the people by a decisive atheistical onslaught. A coarsely blasphemous play, *The Celestial Mechanism*, was composed, in which all the force of socialistic beastliness was used to mock at all religious beliefs, while the Deity and the saints were caricatured as contemptible frauds and adventurers. The very best "artistes" were called upon to act this play, and put forth all their contemptible and venal skill, being paid at increased rates, and receiving extra rations as a reward. The Communist bards were wild with delight in describing the thrilling animation of the actors and the warm enthusiasm of the audience, who, they declared, irresistibly showed their blas-

phemously atheistic ardour. Whether this was so, even once only, we do not know, nor can we deny it; but in any case, after a short run of a few days, the play was withdrawn, and all reference to it ceased absolutely. The great significance of this lies in the fact that this took place in Petrograd, the capital, in the centre of factory workers, at that time carried away by Communism. If here the attempt failed absolutely, there was no chance of its succeeding in the provinces, where these vile compositions did not penetrate, as it was too obvious that the people were absolutely impermeable to atheistic propaganda, either direct or indirect, positive or negative, either in word or deed, either by sacrilege or by blasphemy. . . .

II

I give only a few of the more striking examples of the various and many-sided spiritual temptations which tended to shake the stability of the Russian character and dominate it, to bewilder the sober minds of the nation, and thus imperceptibly poison them with the blasphemy of the vilest religious falsifications. For this purpose special proletarian "catechisms" and soldiers' "manuals" were compiled, in which the commonly used Christian Church prayers were sacrilegiously parodied in the socialistic-Bolshevist manner, serving as a convenient means of introducing the atheistic Communist poison.

The Russian people bore everything in their wide comprehensiveness, which does not exclude the negative point of view, in so far as it *humanum est.*

In this the Russian people *in contrario* has shown its "national universality," and has confirmed the prophetic view expressed by the great literary seer, F. M. Dostoievsky, who in 1882, in his speech at the opening of the monument to the poet Pushkin in Moscow, said: "What is the strength of the Russian national spirit, if not a tendency, in its final aims, towards universality and 'all humanity'? . . . The Russian is destined to be All-European and universal. To become a real Russian, to become a complete Russian, may mean becoming the brother of all mankind, becoming an 'all-man,' so to speak. . . . Of all nations, the heart of the Russian is, perhaps, most fitted for universal brotherhood."

This sacred peculiarity of the Russian people is too perceptible and too indisputable to every Russian exile, who has had bitter experience of the full force of European universality and Western humanity. On the contrary, in the Russian, who knows no limits to the direct expression of humanity whenever an opportunity for such expression presents itself, we are always conscious of a warmth of natural emanation of

all-human sympathy and of a whole-hearted willingness to help everyone, following the example of our Heavenly Father, " who maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." (Matt. v. 45). As the " people's " poet Nekrassov has truly said,

" Gold, gold,
Is the heart of the people."

This inborn Russian tendency to universal goodwill has been misused for the material anti-Christian purposes of Communistic Bolshevism, which blinded and at first attracted adherents by its specious internationality, which seemed to be the best ready-made form of universal brotherhood. This latter, however, can be realized by Russians only on the basis of nationality, and therefore only by means of religious Christian factors which are above nationality, which penetrate and rise to the limits of reality; otherwise it is a mere deception and satanic treachery.

It means that Russians tested Communism by Christianity, and found confirmation for it both in its likeness and its contradictions to the latter.

Practically, only the contradictions were found to exist. The popular power of the " People's Commissars " trampled the people's religion in the mud and suppressed all its pious requirements. In August, 1920, the workmen of several Petrograd works wished to hold a thanksgiving service on the feast of the Transfiguration, but the Communist usurpers contemptuously refused permission and billed the whole town with a sacrilegious " manifesto." At the end of 1921 several Moscow tobacco manufacturers formally and publicly passed a resolution that they would take a holiday for the purpose of celebrating the feast of the Birth of the Virgin Mary in church, and were heavily fined for it. When, on the grounds of its being a legalized day of rest and on the basis of the established number of working hours, the Moscow carters declined to cart wood fuel on a Sunday, they were discharged by the authorities as strikers. . . .

The people took notice of all this, and, convinced that Communism was simply exploitation and oppression, " departed from it to do good " (Ps. xxxiv. 15), and became more firmly rooted in their Orthodox faith. They suffered for this faith, and kept to it throughout all the Bolshevist persecution, preserving it as their Holy of Holies, and showed themselves to the whole world as the " God-bearers." They were seduced from the Church by insidious accusations of its having become a traitor to the ideals of the people for the sake of political subserviency; but the people were clever enough to see through

this deception, and returned to the bosom of the Church with submission, self-denial, and self-sacrifice. Now the Church is their only stay, and their last hope of any life. In it they find oblivion, comfort, and regeneration. People of all conditions fill the Orthodox churches, where one may meet workmen. Red Army men, and even Communists—sometimes responsible commissars. . . . This takes place in the capitals, in full view of the Bolshevist persecutors, in spite of all the restrictions as to time and numberless prohibitions and threats.

All the more undoubted is the unusual religious revival in the villages. The peasantry have become the only source of revenue and profitable victims of mad Bolshevist prodigality, and have lost their all, being obliged to hide their last remaining scraps from the rapacity of the Communists. In spite of all this, the peasants are very responsive to all religious demands, keeping their churches in good order and adequately providing for their clergy. A foreigner, strolling about ruined Petrograd, loudly expressed his astonishment that only the churches were being repaired, while many houses were collapsing and burying passers-by in their ruins. The clergy are fed so well that the Bolsheviks propose to introduce fixed rations for the clergy, and to forbid "free-will offerings." As regards religion, the Russian people have successfully passed their examination of martyrdom, and have not abandoned Orthodoxy either for atheism, foreign religions, or sectarianism, and have justified the fair fame of "Holy Russia."

Of course, such a favourable result of the demoniacal anti-Christian experiment could not have been attained without the clergy, to whom the greater part of the honour is due. The higher clergy, especially the Patriarch, are worthy of special mention. Here it is sufficient to say that they were, and are, worthy of their highly responsible and, at present, dangerous position. The apostates are very few, being principally chance elements who had been appointed owing to the slackness and favouritism of the secular authorities who had set aside or evaded ecclesiastical control. Information is still coming to hand that Russian bishops are still shedding their blood rather than forsake their trust, and are still leaders of their Christian flock. The higher clergy have shed every vestige of administrative aloofness and bureaucratic seclusion, and have become really and truly shepherds of the people. At present there are over 200 bishops in Russia—a number never attained at the most flourishing period of Tzarism, and most astonishing in view of the enormous reduction of the territory under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. This alone shows the national popularity of the Russian episcopate, which has now reached the provincial strata, and has

penetrated to the villages and hamlets, becoming the closest guide of the life of the people.

The rank and file of the Russian clergy are, proportionately, not a whit behind their superiors, while, taking all the circumstances into consideration, they may stand even higher. They perished without a murmur and without record in enormous numbers. According to certain data, the number of priests killed by the Bolsheviks reached 1,215;* but we have reason to think that the actual number was far greater, if all the ranks of the clergy are taken into account. Moreover, the number of apostates is very small, most of them being of the lower clergy—*i.e.*, readers, clerks, and partly deacons, while hardly a priest is mentioned. Like true "soldiers of Christ," all remain at their sacred posts, which are, at present, especially conducive to salvation, and attract all sensitive and noble hearts by the opportunity for self-sacrifice. Therefore we now see in Russia what was very rare in former times—the highest Tzarist officials are taking Holy Orders as simple country priests, highly educated young men of noble birth leave the capital to become parish priests in far-away provinces, frequently acting as prison chaplains; eminent secular professors of their own free will enter Holy Orders, some of them even managing very successfully to combine service in the clinical hospital with that in the pulpit (*e.g.*, in Tashkend). The clergy are constantly holding services, always with due solemnity. A great number of churches have good—even excellent—choirs, though congregational singing is widely spread. The Russian priest, historically and invariably near to the Russian people, has now become the authoritative instructor of the people in all "questions of life." Formerly sermons were somewhat of a rarity: now no service is complete without one, and even outside the church the most varied addresses on religious subjects are now given, attracting large audiences. Formerly the sermons were often very "bookish," and in towns often led to a perceptible exodus of the congregation; at the present time the people crowd round the pulpit,† listening attentively, and there and then expressing their impressions, feelings, and desires.

Of course, under the new order there is no disciplined smoothness, and sometimes the ardour of neophytes, knowing no traditions or school, results in exalted originality and ecstatic impulsiveness, but gradually the stream is returning to its ordinary banks, and is filling those who are thirsting for the truth of God.

* See weekly review of the Supreme Monarchical Council in Berlin of November 28, 1921, No. 18, p. 3, in the article "The Soviet Golgotha."

† There are no pews in the Russian Church.

The people keep to the church and even take part in all-night services, which are now usually very well attended, and the clergy serve God for them and with them " from the morning watch until night " (Ps. xxxix. 5), and are a " light which the darkness comprehendeth not " (John i. 5).

Their close union is now confirmed by common martyrdom. Death is hovering all over Russia, and everyone is walking in its shadow. The shepherds have taught their flock to sacrifice themselves like Christians, and now all know how to offer their lives as a sacrifice to God. Bolshevist Soviet Russia is one enormous Nero's Colosseum. In this ready-made arena, among the infuriated, snarling, brutal cannibals, one can only pray and die, like all the Orthodox who perished at the hands of the Bolshevist executioners—fearlessly, heroically, grandly, and like true Christians.* I shall give a few examples, characteristic of the various categories of Churchmen.

In an ancient and wholly ecclesiastical corner of the Novgorod province a gang of Communists attacked the local monasteries and convents and dispersed the monks and nuns, arresting the more prominent members. Many were very old, among them being the aged bishop and a decrepit abbess. All were driven in a crowd through the frost into a field, the weak and stragglers being made to advance by blows of rifle-butts. Bishop Varsonofi blessed and sped everyone, inspiring them with courage, so that all manfully stood in a row facing the muzzles of the rifles while the gallant bishop, who had formerly exposed the impiety of the Bolsheviks, knelt down and lifted his hands in prayer for all to the merciful God. Three volleys were fired, but the bishop remained immovable among the fallen and groaning—with enlightened eyes turned to the heavens to plead before the Father for sinful mankind. Then he said that he had finished and was ready to appear before God's Judgment Seat; but now the stifled conscience of the Red Army men was awakened by mystic terror, and they refused to shoot, and the bishop had to be killed by the devilish " commissar " himself, who for a long time would not allow the body of the bishop to be buried, but let it lie to be mocked at. Is this not a real martyr ?

The late Tzar's chaplain, the Archpriest Alexander Petrovich Vassiliev, was a Smolensk peasant by birth. He was the pupil of the well-known educationist and humanist, Professor S. A. Rachnisky, and had never taken part in politics. He was arrested simply because of his nearness to the family of the Tzar, and was imprisoned in one cell with his son, a youth.

* According to the weekly review of the Supreme Monarchist Council (No. 18, 1921), Bolsheviks killed 1,766,110 persons.

Here they languished for a long time (till the end of 1918), calculating when their turn to die would come. It is difficult even to imagine this slow torture. Finally the father was taken out to be shot in the bitter frost, in nothing but his underlinen. The worthy servant of God went to his death singing Psalm xxv.: "Plead my cause, O Lord, with them that strive with me; fight against them that fight against us," and, what was touching, prayed for his executioners, telling them that as a man and a priest he forgave them for their enforced execution of him. . . . Such lofty Christian spiritual courage is truly miraculous, just because it has become a source of courage to the faithful transmitted through the very mouths of his murderers.

The well-known Monarchist, Professor Boris Vladimirovich Nikolsky, was enticed from Voronezh by the Petrograd Communists, by being invited to read popular lectures at his own courses, and was soon condemned to death, together with a numerous party of other victims. He begged for and obtained the sad privilege of dying last, in order to bless and administer religious consolation to his unfortunate comrades, who did, indeed, give up their lives with heroic calmness. Through one of the Red Army men who took part in the evil deed, the Professor sent his blessing and prayer to his only daughter. The Bolsheviks took away his body to feed the wild beasts at the Petrograd Zoological Gardens, which was under the superintendence of the "artiste" M. F. Andreyeva, wife of Maxim Gorky, the Bolshevist apologist.* Does not this remind one of Nero's times, while exceeding them in satanic refinement?

The heathens of ancient times were astonished and awed by Christians dying, and thereby conquering by death itself. The Russian martyrs of the Bolsheviks are worthy of their early Christian prototypes, and, by God's grace, will yield the same blessed fruits.

At some "spiritual" Orthodox feast, a clergyman of another creed publicly expressed his opinion that no Church stood higher than the Russian, as no other had so many martyrs, and "the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," which spread Christianity and regenerated the ancient world. We believe that now, likewise, the Russian martyrs in communion with the departed and the Church Militant will regenerate "Holy Russia" by Christian means, and save the world from satanic anarchy for the Kingdom of God.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS GLUBOKOVSKY, D.D.

Sunday, 1, 1/14, 1922.
IN EXILE AT KÄRSTILÄ,
NEAR WIBORG, FINLAND.

* See the Helsingfors *Novaya Russkaya Zizn* (New Russian Life), No. 227, November 12, 1920.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

PROFESSOR JULES LEBRETON is Professor of the History of Christian Origins at the Catholic Institute of Paris. He is well known as the author of the standard work entitled *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité.*

A companion article to that which we publish to-day from the pen of Professor Glubokovsky appeared in our contemporary, *The Christian East*, in July, 1922. The two articles together give an impressive picture of what the Church in Russia is suffering.

The Rev. Maurice Frost sends us the following:

I.—MORS PERPETUA

In THEOLOGY for May, p. 293, reference is made to the phrase *mors perpetua* as gradually supplanting *mors secunda*. The following are the last two stanzas of the *Deo gratias* at the end of Lauds, the Office of Pierre de Corbeil (p. 104 of Abbé Villetard's edition):

"Cuius misericordia
et ammiranda bonitas
a morte nos perpetua,
aduentu primo, liberat;

"Secundo nos eripiat
ab infernali fouea,
Ut in polorum regia
Deo dicamus gratias!"

II.—THE WORLD, THE FLESH, AND THE DEVIL.

Another reference to the Aberdeen Breviary may be added to those given in the June Number of THEOLOGY, p. 350:

S. Modanus (f. LI., February 4), *Ad matutinas. . . . Lectio prima.*
"sicuti miles chr*isti* strenu*us et* bellicosus
adversus dyabolu*m* carne*m* et mundu*m*. . . .

The phrase is the subject of a lengthy explanation in "A Body of Divinitie, or the summe and substance of the Christian Religion. . . . Composed long since by James Usher, B. of Armagh . . ." (4th edition, 1653, p. 333).

"*What is the Spirituall Warfare?* The daily exercise of our spiritual *strength* and *armour* . . . there being joyned with Repentance a continuall fighting and strugling against the assaults of a mans owne flesh, against the motions of the Devill, and the enticements of the World."

(This is expanded in thirty-nine questions and answers.)

MAURICE FROST.

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the enquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE APOSTOLIC GNOSIS"

Sir,

I trust it may be possible to demonstrate in a short letter the entire irrelevance and unfairness of your reviewer's *reductio ad absurdum* of our thesis as regards the Greek Gematria.

He brings in an English Gematria with a "series" numeration—1-26—for the values of the letters of our alphabet, and by aid of an unrestricted choice of words from our almost exhaustless vocabulary, he succeeds in the (very simple) task of coining sentences, nonsensical or otherwise, and points in triumph to an achievement he obviously thinks to be destructive of our position. Not so, however, as these facts should demonstrate.

(1) The value (total) of the 26 English letters is 351, the total of the 24 Greek letters being 3,999.

This means that the average Gematria of an English word will be less than a tenth of the value of a Greek word of equivalent length. As a matter of fact it will be found often that there is a much greater disparity.

E.g. (Greek) χ ρ ι σ τ ο ς
600, 100, 10, 200, 300, 70, 200 = 1,480

(English) C h r i s t o s
3, 8, 18, 9, 19, 20, 15, 19 = 111

showing English value as $\frac{3}{40}$ only of the Greek.

Or, take the name of Jesus:

(*a*) (Greek) ι η σ ο υ ς
10, 8, 200, 70, 400, 200 = 888

(*b*) (English) I E S O U S
9, 5, 19, 15, 21, 19 = 88,

or $\frac{11}{111}$ of the Greek.

This means that your reviewer is using a system in which the number of natural coincidences of value in the totals is *tenfold greater* than in the Greek.

This vitiates his whole position, and shows it to be fundamentally unfair.

It would be easy to adduce other contrasts between the legitimate Gematria and that which he offers, but it would need the space of an article to do this effectively.

I must therefore be content with the single demonstration above.

FREDERICK BLIGH BOND.

[We have also received a letter from Dr. Lea, the other author of the book, protesting against the unfairness of the review.]

Sir,

I have no fault to find with Professor Taylor's not unsympathetic review of my book *Creeds or no Creeds?* except with regard to his treatment of my highly condensed (and, of course, inadequate) account of the Kantian doctrine of Relativity, in which he attributes to me (perhaps owing to my own want of lucidity) several statements I do not make, and views I do not hold.

(1) I do not state that *according to Kant himself* the object of knowledge is "in all cases something mental," but only that the doctrine of Relativity, as taught in *The First Critique* (1st edition) amounts to this. I expressly state (p. 69) that in his two later *Critiques* he attributes to the human mind objective knowledge, especially of God and of the Moral Law; but I argue (like many others) that this is inconsistent with the principle of the Relativity of Human Knowledge, as originally enunciated in *The Critique of Pure Reason.*

(2) I have nowhere denied the well-known fact that Kant laid great stress upon the *a priori* element in human knowledge; but since this *a priori* knowledge is only of "phenomena," not of objective "things-in-themselves," I have contended that at bottom it is only *psychological* knowledge—knowledge of the structure of our own minds, not of the actual nature of objective things. Modernists are therefore, in my opinion, quite justified in appealing to Kant—at any rate to the Kant of the *First Critique*—in support of their contention that theology and ethics ought to be based on "psychology" and "experience." Kant's *a priori* knowledge is only internal experience of the structure of one's own mind, not knowledge of objective reality.

(3) I should find it much easier to acquiesce in Professor Taylor's judgment that my criticisms of Kant are valueless, if they were original. Since, however, they are all derived either (1) from Hegel, a philosopher to whom Professor Taylor owes much; or (2) from Mr. H. A. Prichard, whose *Kant's Theory of Knowledge* is widely regarded as the most penetrating criticism of that philosopher which has appeared for many years; or (3) from Professor Cook Wilson's unpublished lectures, I cannot help feeling that, even if not conclusive, they are weighty, and that they deserve more serious consideration than Professor Taylor has given them.

CHARLES HARRIS.

REVIEWS

THE BOOK OF JOB

THE BOOK OF JOB. A revised text and version. By C. J. Ball, D.Litt. With a Preface by C. F. Burney, D.Litt. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1922. Pp. 479. 25s. net.

THE STORY OF JOB. A Sympathetic Study of the Book of Job in the Light of History and Literature. By the Rev. Minos Devine, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co., 1921. Pp. 302. 8s. 6d. net.

As it stands, the Book of Job, while everyone feels its extraordinary fascination, remains unintelligible to the majority of readers. The argument requires much effort if we try to follow it; the highly-wrought, pictorial style abounds in choice words and surprising turns of thought which are not easy to understand; but in a large measure the peculiar difficulties of Job arise from the insecure condition of the text. As to the argument and general interpretation of the poem a great deal has been done in recent years to clear the way. For example, it is now generally agreed that xxvii. 7-23 must be taken out of the lips of Job and given to Zophar; that the superb chapter xxviii. and the Elihu chapters (xxxiii.-xxxvii.) are later additions; and that the poem originally reached its climax in one speech of Yahweh (xxxviii. 1.–xl. 2, omitting xl. 6–xli. 34) and one speech of Job (xl. 3-5, xlii. 2-6). Dr. Ball takes all this for granted, and concentrates himself upon the Hebrew text. Never before, it is not too much to say, have the difficulties of the text been faced so resolutely, and on the whole so successfully, as in the present work.

We have grown accustomed to a conventional way of explaining certain words and phrases which, when we look at them afresh, really make no sense at all. As our studies have advanced we have come to feel more and more dissatisfied with these philological *tours de force*. Instead of believing that we are bound to make the best of the text as it stands, may we not believe that the poet intended to make himself intelligible, and to write poetry that will scan? That is the starting-point with Dr. Ball. His experiments in the recovery of the original text are remarkable for their freshness and independence; if he is courageous in restoration, he can always be trusted to write good Hebrew—which is more than can be said even of Duhm; and he wins our confidence as much by his taste and sound judgment as by his mastery of the Semitic tongues.

A few specimens will illustrate his skill. In chapter vi. Job complains of his friends' want of sympathy, and in *v.* 14

occur the meaningless lines, " to the dissolving from his friend kindness, and he forsaketh the fear of Shaddai," out of which the R.V. tries to make sense by inserting *should be shewed.* Adopting a hint from the LXX., Dr. Ball restores both grammar and meaning, and reads,

> " My friend hath refused mercy,
> And forsaketh the fear of Shaddai."

It is interesting to notice what he makes of the important passage, xix. 25 *f.*:

> " For I, I know my Avenger,
> And at last He will rise up on earth;
> I shall see, while I yet live, El's revenges,
> And in my flesh I shall gaze on Eloah."

In the first line *liveth* is struck out as metrically redundant, and due to a mistaken repetition of similar letters in the context; in the third line, out of words which are marked by Driver-Gray as untranslatable, Dr. Ball has made one of his happiest conjectures. The effect of it is to represent Job as looking forward to the vision of God, not in the after-world, still less in the day of resurrection, but in this present life, within the limits of the poem itself. And as a matter of fact his expectation is fulfilled; for in the end Job is able to confess (xlii. 5),

> " By mere hearsay had I heard of Thee,
> But now mine own eye hath seen Thee."

So far as the poet arrives at a solution of the mysteries of Providence, he would have us find it here, in the vision of God; Job attains to it at last!

A few more of Dr. Ball's successful emendations may be mentioned. Instead of the irrelevant questions in xxiv. 1, based upon dubious renderings of the current text, he proposes,

> " Why are not oppressors annihilated,
> And bad men see not their own ruin?"

The normal unit in the metre of Job is the couplet with three beats in each line; accordingly in xxxiv. 29, 30, by connecting the third line of *v.* 29 with the single line of *v.* 30, and slightly correcting a few letters, we may read,

> " If against a nation His Wrath be kindled,
> And He make king a profane one, an oppressor of the people."

This is one of the passages which Driver-Gray leave untranslated as incurably corrupt. On similar lines a convincing reconstruction is proposed for xxxix. 3 *f.*:

> " They bow, they liberate their young,—
> Their pains they cast forth, and are well," etc.

In the famous description of the war-horse (xxxix. 21)—" They paw in the valley, and he rejoices in his strength; he goes forth to meet the weapons "—even in English the four

beats in the first line sound out of harmony with the three beats in the second, while the change from plural to singular betrays an error in the text; by little more than a re-arrangement we obtain this admirable couplet:

> "He paws and exults in his strength,
> He goes out into the valley to face arms."

One more specimen may be given, because it shows how effectively Dr. Ball can use his special knowledge of Assyrian. Taking the unique word *bûl* (R.V. "food") in xl. 20 as equal to the Assyrian *bûlu*, "cattle," he suggests,

> "The cattle of the mountains gaze at him [*i.e.*, the hippopotamus],
> And all the beasts of the field are astounded"—

a lifelike touch, in place of the unreal description in the traditional text.

All through the commentary Dr. Ball has much to tell us about the Babylonian ancestry of Hebrew language and ideas. We may welcome the fresh light which he throws upon the subject, without following him into a remoter region of pure speculation. A philologist of Dr. Ball's acquirements can make excellent play with biliteral roots; but we have still to be convinced that any blood-relationship exists between Sumerian and Chinese, or between Sumerian and Akkadian—the non-Semitic and Semitic languages of Babylonia—or, again, between Sumerian and Hebrew. These excursions into speculative philology may interest some scholars; others will think them incongruous; at the same time, the more one works at Dr. Ball's book, the more one learns to appreciate its value. It should be added that those who do not read Hebrew will find his new English version and the exegetical notes which he lets fall, as it were, by the way singularly illuminating.

In his "sympathetic study" Mr. Devine has aimed at making Job both intelligible and edifying to the English reader, and with admirable success. Abandoning the usual method of a commentary, he brings to the exposition of the argument a mind well-versed in general literature, and he enables us to enjoy the poem all the better for the illustrations which he draws from our own poets and philosophers. The only thing we regret is that Mr. Devine has not been able to accept the results of modern literary criticism. He makes a brave attempt to work chapter xxviii., and the Elihu section, into the main thread of the discourses, with the result that the reader is left wondering once more at the artificiality which has marked so much interpretation of the Bible. Why not accept the relief which is offered? In spite of his refusal, however, Mr. Devine has written a most attractive book, which deserves to be widely read.

G. A. Cooke.

PINCHBECK

1. The Inner Meaning of the Four Gospels. By Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B. C. W. Daniel, Ltd. 3s. 6d. net.
2. Theou Sophia: Elucidating the Science and Philosophy of the Divine Mysteries. Vol. I.: *Graduation.* By Holden Edward Sampson. William Rider and Son, Ltd. 8s. 6d.
3. The Proofs of the Truths of Spiritualism. By Rev. Professor G. Henslow, M.A., F.L.S., F.G.S., F.R.H.S. With fifty-one illustrations of Spirit Drawings, etc. Kegan Paul. Second Edition. 1919. 7s. 6d. net.
4. Spirit Psychometry. By Professor Henslow. W. Rider. 3s. 6d. net.
5. The Religion of the Spirit World. By Professor Henslow. Kegan Paul. 1920. 6s. net.

We have before us a typical pile of books, produced by the New Age and given to the admiring Universe quite recently. In point of fact they have most of them been produced before, and long ago forgotten. Origen moved among their authors and the Alexandrines wrote their reviews, more trenchantly than the law of libel allows us to do. But the *Illuminati* are mercifully (for them) unconscious of the fact of their being a re-incarnation.

Here, for example, is Mr. Sadler. In 102 pages—with wide margins—he will tell us all about *The Inner Meaning of the Four Gospels*, which Tradition has so unaccountably missed up to now, as it did in the case of Martin Luther. His equipment is a Mastership of Arts and a Baccalaureate in Laws. His book forms the first volume of a series of four on *The World Religion*, all to be described, it would seem, in a little over four hundred pages, a brevity comparable to that of the feminine dress of the New Age, unless Paris succeeds in correcting it. Marvellous! And truly considerate for the enquirer after Truth. *The Inner Meaning* is stated to be "Re-interpreted in the Light of Modern Research and in Relation to Spiritual and Social Needs." They evidently go into a small space, and we note with joy the "re-." We must look into it. For instance, what has he to say in "re-interpretation" of the Miracles, a moot point and a thorny? Take, *e.g.*, the "Cleansing of the Leper" (Matt. viii. 1-4). "It seems," says Mr. Sadler the Re-interpreter, "this story must be symbolical. For leprosy, whether with tubercular nodules or with degeneration of the nerves, is cured very slowly. But the Christ-spirit can make the foulest clean, as a hymn says. It is the soul that is cleansed

by the Ideal Divine." "Must be," "as a hymn says" are delicious, and we seem to have met the former before: the latter we concede to Mr. Sadler as original. Then the "Calming of the Storm" (Matt. viii. 23-27) is dismissed thus: "To actually calm a storm would not be of any moral value, and not even of physical worth, as storms are good to bring harmony once more in nature. The story is a parable become a miracle. The storm is in men's souls." Well, not so new after all, but "inner" of course, the "innerness" of the peculiar consciousness of Mr. Sadler. And talk of the Infallibility of the Pope after that! The pious reader will find many like "re-interpretations" if he pursues Mr. Sadler further. One is only a guide-post and must pass on.

We reach next Mr. Sampson. He has written a number of books, apparently, one entitled *Ek-klesia*, another *The Happiest People in the World*. One hopes, and believes, that Mr. Sampson himself belongs to the latter category, for he evidently enjoys the use of his pen. And he has before him so magnificent a field for discovery. Here he presents us with *Theou Sophia*, considerately transliterated for the Greekless crowd of the ordinary *βωμολόχοι*. It is described as "Series Three. In Two Parts." Part One is "Graduation. The Tests of the Golden Keys." That is a joyous enough title to start with. One can only hope that the level will not be let down in Part Two. Unlike Mr. Sadler, who packs the whole of his *World Religion* into four short volumes of 100 odd pages each, Mr. Sampson condescends to more prolix presentment. Further, he assists the stupidity of the average reader by a copious use of italics, not to say whole sentences in capital letters. We will cull one passage at random, as a taste of his quality:

Master: Define the Symbolism of "*Hagar*," as taught by the Apostle *Paul*.

Disciple: (3) "*Hagar*." The name of "*Hagar*" is a word signifying "*afraid*," "*fleeing*," *i.e.*, *a coward*, *a runaway* at heart, a person who is not generically nor hereditarily a disciple of the PATH OF THE DIVINE MYSTERIES; a "stranger," a "*bond-servant*," in the EK-KLESIA.

We feel sure that Mr. Sampson honestly believes he knows all about Hagar; we are equally certain that if Hagar had realized she meant all that she would have blushed furiously. Perhaps that was the true reason why she rushed into the wilderness: she could not bear the true significance of herself.

The New Age gives an obvious chance to the Religious Founder. Mr. Sampson is more capable, but hardly more interesting, than the gentleman from Balham (or Upper Tooting)

who is the founder of the " Church of the Kosmon " (surely it should be " Kosmou "?) and whose God is the Lord " JEHOVIH." He sets out his religion obligingly in one short pamphlet of four to eight pages—I have unfortunately mislaid it and so missed my chance of conversion—and is good enough to supply a portrait of himself attired as an Anglican dignitary of the lesser sort (say, a Rural Dean) in surplice of moderate length and coloured stole. He does not seem to have attracted many adherents, and he is no longer young, so that he will have to make haste.

And of course there is Spiritism. There always is, though it may not always have been so silly as it is in this New Age. The Rev. Professor Henslow, M.A., F.L.S., F.G.S., F.R.H.S., gives an account of the " Religion of the Spirit World " and adduces the " Proofs of the Truths of Spiritualism." The " proofs," as one would expect, are largely a triumph of the camera. " There are the actual pictures, so what more do you want ?" But plates and films are tricky things, and you can never be sure of what you are getting, as Mr. Maskelyne and others have been showing recently. The proof is objective enough if you can trust your films, and it has been abundantly shown that that is just what you can't do. There are other " proofs," to be sure, from Automatic Writing, Trance, Apports, Poltergeists, Radiomediumistic Phenemona, Matter through Matter, Levitation, Spirit Lights, Spirit Bodies and Clothes, Psychography, Materializations, etc. So there is abundance of choice. But *what* are these spirits ? Are they mortals or demons ? Mr. Raupert, who has much to say on this subject and is a competent guide, strongly affirms that they are the latter. And anyway, who can really tell ? That is the whole crux. It is not convincing to be presented with a photograph if that photograph is really a true portrait of his Satanic Majesty in this guise or one of his lieutenants. And if he could deceive great Saints for a time, he could certainly deceive a camera.

Parallel with the *Proofs* is *Spirit Psychometry*, an account of the experiences of an extraordinary Welsh medium. There are fifteen chapters. Chapter xv., " Dora in a Little Tiff," would probably be found not the least arresting. There is plenty of the " experience " we are all now told is the true test. But what of the explanation of the experience, the only thing that really signifies ?

The Religion of the Spirit World seems to be mainly " the religion of the Rev. Stainton Moses." Here is some of it (p. 100): " What the Church requires—and that urgently—is to go back, restudy, and restate the exact teaching of Christ. This can only be done by restoring the true meanings of the

Greek in our New Testament, and eliminating every erroneous word and misleading idea and wrong terms in our English Bible, and so recover the exact meaning of our Lord's words. In that way we shall discover that He was solely concerned with *Character* and *Conduct*, for it is these which constitute *Salvation, i.e.*, Spiritual Health and *Eternal Life*." Perhaps Mr. Stainton Moses is not responsible for the italics, and they are merely an "earth-product." But the things that are true in his statement we did not need a spook to tell us, and he does not yet, even on the Other Side, seem to have realised that the English Bible is not the Bible of the whole Church or anything like the whole, which extends far beyond the narrow borders of England. One would like, by the way, to have Mr. Moses' opinion on Mr. Sadler's *Inner Meaning*. Perhaps some devotee will be so obliging as to ask him and let us know the result.

Chapter x. gives us "The true Spiritual Meanings of 'Heaven' and 'Hell.'" One may be grateful to find no reference to psychic cigars or ethereal whisky-and-sodas. But one turns with thankfulness to the sane and healthy and truly inspired visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the Beloved Disciple. One does not feel that Professor Henslow has yet surpassed the Apocalypse.

Poor New Age! It tries and tries to be interesting and original. But the Given, the Revealed, the Faith once for all delivered, is too much for it. The Fathers have said some fantastic things at times (be it admitted with bated breath), but at least they have kept a certain level. "Hagar" would have been beyond them—dare one say, beneath them. And one page of Tauler, St. John of the Cross, St. Theresa of Spain, St. Catherine of Genoa, Ruysbroeck would, one is convinced, be felt by the impartial reader worth whole volumes of the sort we have been dealing with. In fact, they are not in the same library. One could be sorry for the New Religions if one did not see abundant reason to be content with the Old, even in its literary products. After all, the New Age is but a passing phase of the life of the agelong Church. It will soon be old enough, "so soon passeth it away and we are gone."

R. Ll. Langford-James.

NOTICES

THE CONTROL OF PARENTHOOD. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, London and New York. Price 7s. 6d.

This is a little book of about two hundred pages dealing with the great problem of Parenthood and furnished with an Introduction by the Bishop of Birmingham.

The problem is considered under four aspects—the Biological, Economic, Social-Religious, and Imperial Racial. The papers are by authors whose views are diametrically opposed to each other, and a certain sense of incongruousness is experienced by the reader. Evidently the editor, the Rev. James Marchant, thinks it wise that the public should have the opportunity to study the problem all round, and then seek its solution by the light of its own conscience.

There is something to be said for the honesty and fair-mindedness of the method, but we should have liked some more definite guidance as to the things which are lovely, true, and of good report.

The first paper, on " The Biological Aspects of the Control of Parenthood," is by Professor J. Arthur Thomson, M.A., LL.D. It is a very interesting paper, and deals with the subject sympathetically and scientifically.

There is a section on " The Survival Value of Fertility " which points out that the " struggle for existence " when keen enough leads to " natural selection "—that is to say, that when severe and long-continued, it causes the survival of certain variants who are for one reason or another best adapted to their environment.

Professor Thomson points out the advantages of the " spawning " method of securing survival among the lowly organized creatures. So many individuals are produced that a sufficient number survive to maintain the species. With this he contrasts " Economized Reproductivity " —fewer individuals are produced, but a large proportion of those produced survive owing to intensity of parental care. The former method is common in vegetable and lower forms of animal life, and the latter in the higher vertebrates and in man.

Professor Thomson mentions the conclusion reached by Herbert Spencer, that genesis decreases as individuation increases—that is, that individuation and genesis tend to be in inverse ratio; but as the Professor points out, there is no real antithesis between high individuation and reproductivity. The strongly individuated Brahmins and Rajputs show no lessening of fertility.

The problem of possible over-population is not a new one. It was known to the Greeks two thousand years ago, and the question that arose then still arises—Would artificial control of the birth-rate be for the welfare of the race ? Professor Thomson considers this question carefully, and finishes his essay on this note: " While we must not allow the word 'artificial' to be a bogey, we know that the substitution of mechanical control for moral control can never be regarded with *entire* equanimity."

In the second section of the book, Leonard Hill, M.B., F.R.S., discusses the physiology of reproduction in various races of living creatures, also the conditions which promote and hinder fertility and those which

influence the rate of infantile mortality. He points out the devitalizing conditions of urban life.

Professor Hill advocates the moderating of sexual desire by wisely regulated diet, hard physical exercise, and full occupation—the playing, not the mere watching, of games. He is of opinion that the artificial methods of preventing conception " disturb the normality of the sexual act "—and adds: " The effect on the nervous and bodily health of those who use such means cannot be otherwise than harmful." In view of the overcrowded cities at home and our wide Dominions languishing for want of adequate population, he strongly urges wise migration within the Empire.

Dean Inge, D.D., points to the causes of our industrial discontent and to the national dangers caused thereby. He does not think there is any prospect of a return to the content and prosperity of the mid-Victorian era, and he emphasizes the many economic obstacles to the begetting of a normal family by couples who desire comfort for themselves and a fair start in life for their children.

The Dean deprecates a materialistic view of married life, and insists on the duty of treating our natural functions with " sanctification and honour." He says that it must be left to individuals to apply this principle to their own married lives, and urges that " self-restraint is not only an excellent moral discipline, but also increases, by spiritualizing, the happiness of conjugal love."

The second paper on the economic aspects of the control of parenthood is by Mr. Harold Cox. He is frankly convinced that the natural increase of the population is a national danger, that it tends to a heavy child mortality, and to a deterioration of the race. Mr. Cox has no reliance on the opinions of many members of the medical profession, and still less on the admonitions of the Churches.

The first paper on the social and religious aspects of the control of parenthood is by Dr. Mary Scharlieb. She recognizes the great economic difficulties in the way of couples who would like to have a natural family, but urges that the use of contraceptives is likely to be injurious to women, because, by relieving married couples of the burden of a large family, it removes one of the safeguards of the wife; " by removing the chief check on the husband's desires and demands, it destroys the wife's protection from his too great insistence and persistence."

She points out that " doctors are practically unanimous in the opinion that young men and young women, even during the years when passion is strongest and self-control most difficult, can safely practise continence; that it does not diminish their subsequent fertility, nor does it injure their health," therefore, " if these young people can be continent without suffering injury, still more can those who are older and whose passions are less eager."

The second paper in this section is by the Rev. F. B. Meyer. He urges that in all questions of birth control—(1) " The wife must be a consenting party. She is not a slave nor a chattel. Her body is her own, and she has the right to refuse as well as to grant." (2) Though the procreation of children is the normal result of the marriage act, it must not be considered to be its sole and exclusive purpose. (3) Whatever is unnatural in the marriage act is to be condemned on moral and physical grounds.

Dr. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London, approaches the problem of control of parenthood "from the standpoint of Christian ethical monotheism." His paper is a courageous endeavour to apply these high principles to the needs of human life. He points out that the procreation of children is not the only object of matrimony, and again that "this function is to be exercised, not instinctively, but rationally and conscientiously. . . . The apparent prodigality of life in the world is not a justification for the reckless multiplication of human life. Regard must be given to quality as well as to quantity."

Dr. Garvie asks whether the population shall be reduced to suit economic conditions, or whether the conditions shall be improved so as to make normal families welcome, and says: "The answer of the social reformer" (and in the writer's judgment his is God's authentic voice) "is that the conditions must be improved." "If personality be the consummation of evolution, then the subordination of things to persons and not of persons to things is the fulfilment of the creative purpose."

The section on the imperial and racial aspects of the control of parenthood opens with an admirable paper by Sir Rider Haggard, K.B.E.

He tells us that at the bottom population is a matter of, and dependent on, food supply. He is of opinion that unless migration within the Empire is encouraged, and unless population of our enormous and sparsely filled Dominions is increased, the days of the British Empire are numbered. It will fall to pieces, and among its heirs must be reckoned the nations of the East. Sir Rider says: "It comes to this then: the Western races and their progeny in varying parts of the earth must either keep up their numbers or run the risk of being submerged by the Eastern races. . . . Nor in every instance is it necessary to look to the East for the immediate and local peril. Thus Africa has aborigines of its own, who with a little more instruction in the white man's arts of war, of which they have received a first lesson at German hands during the last five years, would be quite capable of producing the dreaded catastrophe."

In the next paper Dr. Marie Stopes maintains that "crowding is more destructive of health and happiness than is disease," and says: "I maintain that the only hope for the race is the conscious elimination of all diseased and overcrowded lives *before* their conception, by planning only to conceive those for whom adequate provision of material necessities and a loving welcome are reasonably to be anticipated."

BOOK NOTES

Apology and Polemic in the New Testament. By A. D. Heffern. Macmillan, New York. $3·50.

A good book on this subject would be a valuable contribution to scholarship, for little has been written about it in English. Christianity was from the first a disruptive force in existing society, and must have caused acute controversy. It is reasonable to suppose that the choice of material in the Gospels and Acts, and both the matter and manner of the Epistles, were conditioned by contemporary controversies. Unfortunately, this book with all its learning is almost unreadable. A great deal of irrelevant matter is introduced, and the style is very heavy. In fact, some passages are a model of how theological books should not be written. Thus on page 7 we have: "In approaching the consideration of the general subject, our natural starting-point is the evident fact that

in the New Testament age the Gospel was believed"; and on page 363: "We reach the conclusion that the results converge to the proof of the activity of that movement." None the less, the book will be useful to specialists.

New Testament History. By G. W. Wade. Methuen. 18s.

It is difficult to praise this book rightly. Imagine a Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* published this year embodying the latest research, extract all the articles on New Testament subjects and weave them into a connected whole bearing the impress of one man's mind, and you get some idea of Dr. Wade's book. He has apparently read and digested everything, and has the gift of setting forth vast accumulations of knowledge with unfailing lucidity, great architectural skill, and no unnecessary parade of learning. No one book in English dealing with religious knowledge contains so much as this. At 18s. it is very cheap, for in bulk it equals perhaps six 60,000 words novels. The publisher's enterprise deserves warm commendation.

The critical standpoint is eclectic. The Gospels come in for more radical treatment than the Acts; the Pauline authorship of Ephesians is rejected, the Petrine authorship of Peter accepted; and there are other surprises. The doctrinal position is moderate radical. Frequently Dr. Wade states the arguments pro and con with an appearance of impartiality, but his manner of statement leaves no doubt that his own conclusion is inconsistent with orthodoxy. Thus the Virgin Birth is rejected on literary grounds, and scant justice is done to the many and cumulative arguments of other kinds in its favour. Dr. Wade is to be congratulated on his courage in grappling with the problem of miracles, largely left alone by recent investigators, though we dissent from his conclusions. Each miracle is discussed on its merits; the explanation is frequently rationalistic. The author has a theory that miracles are credible only when they are an extension of certain powers which are found in men to-day, such as telepathy or spiritual healing. In spite of his reverence and learning, we must regard this attitude as highly unsatisfactory.

The Stories of the Kingdom. A Study of the Parables of Jesus. By G. R. H. Shafto. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

This is a work of originality and charm, quite uncontroversial and unreservedly to be commended. The parables are first paraphrased, then briefly explained. Appended to each is a collection of subjects for discussion, selected with great ingenuity, from which many sermons can be preached.

Notes on the Ministry of Reconciliation for Young Missionaries. By G. Callaway, S.S.J.E. S.P.C.K. 2s.

The very modest title of this book may prevent its merits being recognized. Intended primarily for native African priests who can read simple English, but to whom ordinary English books are unsuited, it should also be useful at home. Any book on this subject by a Cowley Father is sure of a welcome.

W. K. L. CLARKE.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.